Control of three heat equations coupled with two cubic nonlinearities

Jean-Michel Coron*, Jean-Philippe Guilleron†

arXiv:1611.08158v1 [math.OC] 24 Nov 2016

Abstract

We study the null controllability of three parabolic equations. The control is acting only on one of the three equations. The three equations are coupled by means of two cubic nonlinearities. The linearized control system around 0 is not null controllable. However, using the cubic nonlinearities, we prove the (global) null controllability of the control system. The proof relies on the return method, an algebraic solvability and smoothing properties of the parabolic equations.

1 Introduction

Let N be a positive integer and let Ω be a nonempty connected bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$ of class C^2. Let ω be a nonempty open subset of Ω. We denote by $\chi_\omega : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ the characteristic function of ω and let $T \in (0, +\infty)$. We are interested in the control system

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_t - \Delta\alpha = \beta^3 & \text{in } (0,T)\times\Omega, \\ \beta_t - \Delta\beta = \gamma^3 & \text{in } (0,T)\times\Omega, \\ \gamma_t - \Delta\gamma = u\chi_\omega & \text{in } (0,T)\times\Omega, \\ \alpha = \beta = \gamma = 0 & \text{in } (0,T)\times\partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

It is a control system where, at time $t \in [0,T]$, the state is $(\alpha(t,\cdot), \beta(t,\cdot), \gamma(t,\cdot))^{\mathrm{tr}} : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^3$ and the control is $u(t,\cdot) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$. Let us point out that, due to the recursive structure of (1.1) (one first solves the last parabolic equation of (1.1), then the second one and finally the first one), it follows from classical results on linear parabolic equations that the Cauchy problem associated to (1.1) is globally well-posed in the L^∞ setting, i.e. with bounded measurable initial data, controls, and solutions.

The main goal of this paper is to prove the following global null controllability result on control system (1.1).

*Université Pierre et Marie Curie-Paris 6, UMR 7598 Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions, 75005 Paris, France. E-mail: coron@ann.jussieu.fr. JMC was supported by the ERC advanced grant 266907 (CPDENL) of the 7th Research Framework Programme (FP7).

†Université Pierre et Marie Curie-Paris 6, UMR 7598 Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions, 75005 Paris, France. E-mail: guilleron@ann.jussieu.fr. JPG was partially supported by the ERC advanced grant 266907 (CPDENL) of the 7th Research Framework Programme (FP7).

Theorem 1 *For every $(\alpha^0, \beta^0, \gamma^0)^{tr} \in L^\infty(\Omega)^3$, there exists a control $u \in L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)$ such that the solution $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)^{tr} \in L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)^3$ to the Cauchy problem*

$$
\left\{
\begin{array}{ll}
\alpha_t - \Delta\alpha = \beta^3 & \text{in } (0,T)\times\Omega, \\
\beta_t - \Delta\beta = \gamma^3 & \text{in } (0,T)\times\Omega, \\
\gamma_t - \Delta\gamma = u\chi_\omega & \text{in } (0,T)\times\Omega, \\
\alpha = \beta = \gamma = 0 & \text{in } (0,T)\times\partial\Omega, \\
\alpha(0,\cdot) = \alpha^0(\cdot),\ \beta(0,\cdot) = \beta^0(\cdot),\ \gamma(0,\cdot) = \gamma^0(\cdot) & \text{in } \Omega,
\end{array}
\right. \tag{1.2}
$$

satisfies

$$
\alpha(T,\cdot) = \beta(T,\cdot) = \gamma(T,\cdot) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega. \tag{1.3}
$$

The controllability of systems of partial differential equations with a small number of controls is an important subject which has been recently investigated in a large number of articles. For the case of linear systems, let us mention in particular

- For systems of parabolic equations in dimension 1 or larger: [21, 20, 26, 29]. A key step in these papers is to establish suitable Carleman estimates. In dimension 1, the method of moments can lead to very precise (and sometimes unexpected) results; see, in particular [8, 7, 10, 11]. See also the survey paper [6] and the reference therein.

- For systems of Schrödinger equations: [2], which uses transmutation together with a controllability result for systems of wave equations proved in the same article. See also [30] for the controllability of a cascade system of conservative equations.

- For Stokes equations of incompressible fluids: [23, 28, 17, 12]. Again Carleman estimates are key ingredients here.

- For hyperbolic equations: [1, 2], which rely on multiplier methods, and [4] which uses microlocal analysis.

Let us assume that 0 is a trajectory (i.e. a solution) of the system of partial differential equations. If the linearized control system is controllable, one can expect to get the local null controllability. For systems of partial differential equations with a small number of controls it has been proven to be the case, for example, for the Navier Stokes equations in [12].

Note that the linearized control system of (1.1) around 0 is clearly not controllable. When the linearized control system around 0 is not controllable one may still expect that the nonlinearities can give the controllability. A method to treat this case is the return method. It consists in looking for (nonzero) trajectories of the control system going from 0 to 0 such that the linearized control system is controllable. This method has been introduced in [13] for a stabilization issue and used for the first time in [14] to get the controllability of a partial differential equation (the Euler equation of incompressible fluids). This method can also be used to get controllability of systems of partial differential equations with a small number of controls. See, for example,

- [15] for a water tank control system modeled by means of the Saint-Venant equations.

- [17, 19] for the Navier-Stokes equations.

- [18] for a system of two nonlinear heat equations.

Let us give more details about [18] since it deals with a control system related to our system (1.1). The control system considered in [18] is

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll} \beta_t - \Delta\beta = \gamma^3 & \text{in } (0,T)\times\Omega, \\ \gamma_t - \Delta\gamma = u\chi_\omega & \text{in } (0,T)\times\Omega, \\ \beta = \gamma = 0 & \text{in } (0,T)\times\partial\Omega, \end{array}\right. \tag{1.4}$$

where, at time $t \in [0,T]$, the state is $(\beta(t,\cdot),\gamma(t,\cdot))^{\rm tr} : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^2$ and the control is $u(t,\cdot) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$. (In fact, slightly more general control systems of two coupled parabolic equations are considered in [18].) Using the return method, it is proved in [18] that the control system (1.4) is locally null controllable. We use the same method here. However the construction of trajectories of the control system going from 0 to 0 such that the linearized control system is (null) controllable is much more complicated for the control system (1.1) than for the control system (1.4).

The construction of trajectories of the control system (1.1) going from 0 to 0 such that the linearized control system is (null) controllable follows from simple scaling arguments (see (4.2) to (4.5) below) and the following theorem.

Theorem 2 *There exists $(a,b,c) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R})^3$ such that*

$$\text{the supports of } a,\ b,\ \text{and } c \text{ are included in } [-1,1]\times[-1,1], \tag{1.5}$$

$$\{(t,r);\ r>0,\ b(t,r)\neq 0 \text{ and } c(t,r)\neq 0\} \neq \emptyset, \tag{1.6}$$

$$a(t,r) = a(t,-r),\ b(t,r) = b(t,-r),\ c(t,r) = c(t,-r),\ \forall (t,r)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}, \tag{1.7}$$

$$a_t - a_{rr} - \frac{N-1}{r}a_r = b^3 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^*, \tag{1.8}$$

$$b_t - b_{rr} - \frac{N-1}{r}b_r = c^3 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^*. \tag{1.9}$$

An important ingredient of the proof of Theorem 2 is the following proposition which is related to Theorem 2 in the stationary case.

Proposition 3 *There exists $(A,B,C) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})^3$ and $\delta_A \in (0,1/2)$ such that*

$$\text{the supports of } A,\ B,\ \text{and } C \text{ are included in } [-1,1], \tag{1.10}$$

$$\{z;\ z>0, B(z)\neq 0 \text{ and } C(z)\neq 0\} \neq \emptyset, \tag{1.11}$$

$$A(z) = A(-z),\ B(z) = B(-z),\ C(z) = C(-z),\ \forall z\in\mathbb{R}, \tag{1.12}$$

$$A(z) = e^{-1/(1-z^2)} \text{ if } 1-\delta_A < z < 1, \tag{1.13}$$

$$-A'' - \frac{N-1}{z}A' = B^3 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^*, \tag{1.14}$$

$$-B'' - \frac{N-1}{z}B' = C^3 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^*, \tag{1.15}$$

$$(B(z) = 0 \text{ and } z\in[0,1)) \Leftrightarrow \left(z = \frac{1}{2}\right), \tag{1.16}$$

$$B'\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) < 0, \tag{1.17}$$

$$C\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) > 0, \tag{1.18}$$

$$(C(z) = 0 \text{ and } z\in[0,1)) \Rightarrow (z\in(0,1) \text{ and } C'(z)\neq 0). \tag{1.19}$$

This proposition is proved in Section 2. In Section 3 we show how to use Proposition 3 in order to prove Theorem 2. Finally, in Section 4, we deduce Theorem 1 from Theorem 2.

Remark 4 *Looking to our proof of Theorem 1, it is natural to conjecture that this theorem still holds if, in* (1.2)*, β^3 and γ^3 are replaced by β^{2p+1} and γ^{2q+1} respectively, where p and q are arbitrary nonnegative integers.*

2 Proof of Proposition 3 (stationary case)

In order to construct A, one shall use the following lemma.

Lemma 5 *There exists $\delta_0 \in (0,1)$ such that, for every $\delta \in (0,\delta_0)$, there exists a function $G \in C^\infty([0,+\infty))$ such that*

$$G(z) = z^3\left(z-\frac{1}{2}\right)^3 \text{ for } \frac{1}{2}-\delta < z < \frac{1}{2}+\delta, \tag{2.1}$$

$$(z-\frac{1}{2})G(z) > 0 \text{ for } 0<z<1,\ z\neq\frac{1}{2}, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\left\{z\in(0,1);\ (G^{1/3})''(z)+\frac{N-1}{z}(G^{1/3})'(z)=0\right\} \text{ is finite}, \tag{2.3}$$

and such that the solution $A:(0,+\infty)\to\mathbb{R}$ to the Cauchy problem

$$A(1)=A'(1)=0,\ A''(z)+\frac{N-1}{z}A'(z)=G(z),\ z>0, \tag{2.4}$$

satisfies

$$\text{there exists } c_0\in\mathbb{R} \text{ such that } A(z)=c_0-z^8 \text{ if } 0<z<\delta, \tag{2.5}$$

$$A(z)=e^{-1/(1-z^2)} \text{ if } 1-\delta<z<1, \tag{2.6}$$

$$A(z)=0 \text{ if } z\in[1,+\infty). \tag{2.7}$$

Proof of Lemma 5. Let us first emphasize that it follows from (2.1) and (2.2) that $G^{1/3}$ is of class C^∞ on $(0,1)$, hence (2.3) makes sense. Let $\delta\in(0,1/4)$. Let $\bar G\in C^\infty([0,+\infty))$ be such that (2.1) and (2.2) hold for $G=\bar G$ and

$$\bar G(z) = -8(6+N)z^6, \forall z\in(0,\delta), \tag{2.8}$$

$$\bar G(z)=\left(\frac{-2+6z^4}{(1-z^2)^4}-\frac{2(N-1)}{(1-z^2)^2}\right)e^{-1/(1-z^2)},\ \forall z\in((1-\delta),1), \tag{2.9}$$

$$\bar G(z)=0,\ \forall z\in(1,+\infty), \tag{2.10}$$

$$\bar G \text{ is analytic on } (0,1)\setminus\{\delta,(1/2)-\delta,(1/2)+\delta,1-\delta\}. \tag{2.11}$$

One easily sees that such $\bar G$ exists if $\delta\in(0,1/4)$ is small enough, the smallness depending on N. Frow now on, δ is always assumed to be small enough. Let $\kappa\in\mathbb{R}$. Let us define $G\in C^\infty([0,+\infty))$ by

$$G:=\bar G \text{ in } [0,\delta]\cup[(1/2)-\delta,(1/2)+\delta]\cup[1-\delta,+\infty), \tag{2.12}$$

$$G(z):=\bar G(z)+\min\{\kappa,0\}e^{-1/(z-\delta)}e^{-1/(1-2\delta-2z)},\ \forall z\in(\delta,(1/2)-\delta), \tag{2.13}$$

$$G(z):=\bar G(z)+\max\{\kappa,0\}e^{-1/(2z-1-2\delta)}e^{-1/(1-\delta-z)},\ \forall z\in((1/2)+\delta,1-\delta). \tag{2.14}$$

Let A be the solution of the Cauchy problem (2.4). From (2.12), one has (2.1) and (2.2). From (2.11), (2.13), and (2.14), one gets that

$$G \text{ is analytic on } (0,1) \setminus \{\delta, (1/2)-\delta, (1/2)+\delta, 1-\delta\}, \tag{2.15}$$

which implies (2.3) since $(G^{1/3})''$ cannot be identically equal to 0 on one of the five intervals $(0,\delta)$, $(\delta,(1/2)-\delta)$, $((1/2)-\delta,(1/2)+\delta)$, $((1/2)+\delta,1-\delta)$, and $(1-\delta,1)$.

Remark 6 *We require* (2.15) *only to get* (2.3). *However* (2.3) *can also be obtained without requiring* (2.15) *by using genericity arguments.*

From (2.4), (2.9), and (2.12), one gets (2.6). From (2.4), (2.10), and (2.12), one gets (2.7).

It remains to prove that, for some $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$, one has (2.5). Let us first point out that, for every $y \in C^2((0,\delta))$,

$$\left(y'' + \frac{N-1}{z}y' = 0\right) \Rightarrow \left(\exists\, (c_0,c_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ such that } y(z) = c_0 + c_1 E(z),\ \forall z \in (0,\delta)\right), \tag{2.16}$$

where

$$\text{if } N \neq 2,\ E(z) := \frac{1}{(2-N)z^{N-2}},\ \forall z \in (0,+\infty), \tag{2.17}$$

$$\text{if } N = 2,\ E(z) := -\ln(z),\ \forall z \in (0,+\infty). \tag{2.18}$$

From (2.4), (2.8), (2.12), one gets that $y := A + z^8$ satisfies the assumption of the implication (2.16). Hence, by (2.16), one gets the existence of $(c_0,c_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that

$$A(z) = c_0 - z^8 + c_1 E(z),\ \forall z \in (0,\delta). \tag{2.19}$$

It suffices to check that, for some $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$c_1 = 0. \tag{2.20}$$

From (2.4), one has

$$\text{if } N \neq 2,\ A(z) = -\frac{1}{(N-2)z^{N-2}}\int_1^z s^{N-1}G(s)ds + \frac{1}{N-2}\int_1^z sG(s)ds,\ \forall z \in (0,1], \tag{2.21}$$

$$\text{if } N = 2,\ A(z) = \ln(z)\int_1^z sG(s)ds - \int_1^z s\ln(s)G(s)ds,\ \forall z \in (0,1], \tag{2.22}$$

which, together with (2.17), (2.18), (2.19), with $z \to 0$, gives

$$c_1 = \int_0^1 s^{N-1}G(s)ds. \tag{2.23}$$

From (2.12), (2.13), and (2.14), one has

$$\lim_{\kappa\to+\infty}\int_0^1 s^{N-1}G(s)ds = +\infty \text{ and } \lim_{\kappa\to-\infty}\int_0^1 s^{N-1}G(s)ds = -\infty. \tag{2.24}$$

In particular, with the intermediate value theorem, there exists $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\int_0^1 s^{N-1}G(s)ds = 0, \tag{2.25}$$

which, together with (2.23), concludes the proof of Lemma 5. ∎

We go back to the proof of Proposition 3. We extend A to all of $\mathbb{R}$ by requiring

$$A(0) = c_0, \tag{2.26}$$

$$A(z) = A(-z),\ \forall z \in (-\infty, 0). \tag{2.27}$$

By (2.5), (2.26), and (2.27), $A \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. Let $B \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^*)$ be defined by

$$B := -\left(A'' + \frac{N-1}{z}A'\right)^{1/3}. \tag{2.28}$$

From (2.27) and (2.28), one gets that

$$B(z) = B(-z),\ \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^*. \tag{2.29}$$

From (2.28), one sees that

$$B \text{ is of class } C^\infty \text{ on the set } \{z \in \mathbb{R}^*;\ B(z) \neq 0\}. \tag{2.30}$$

From (2.5), (2.27), and (2.28), one has

$$B(z) = 2(6+N)^{1/3}z^2, \forall z \in (-\delta, \delta) \setminus \{0\}, \tag{2.31}$$

which allows to extend B to all of $\mathbb{R}$ by continuity by requiring

$$B(0) = 0. \tag{2.32}$$

From (2.31) and (2.32), we get that

$$B \text{ is of class } C^\infty \text{ in } (-\delta, \delta). \tag{2.33}$$

From (2.2), (2.4), and (2.28), one gets that

$$B \neq 0 \text{ in } (0,1) \setminus \{1/2\}, \tag{2.34}$$

which, with (2.30), implies that

$$B \text{ is of class } C^\infty \text{ in } (0,1) \setminus \{1/2\}. \tag{2.35}$$

From (2.1), (2.4), and (2.28), one has

$$B(z) = -z\left(z - \frac{1}{2}\right),\ \forall z \in \left(\frac{1}{2} - \delta, \frac{1}{2} + \delta\right). \tag{2.36}$$

In particular (1.17) holds. From (2.6) and (2.28), one gets

$$B(z) = -\left(\frac{-2+6z^4}{(1-z^2)^4} - \frac{2(N-1)}{(1-z^2)^2}\right)^{1/3} e^{-1/(3-3z^2)},\ \forall z \in (1-\delta, 1), \tag{2.37}$$

which implies the existence of $\delta_0 > 0$ such that, for every $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$,

$$B < 0 \text{ in } (1-\delta, 1). \tag{2.38}$$

From (2.7) and (2.28), one gets

$$B(z) = 0, \forall z \in (1, +\infty), \tag{2.39}$$

which, together with (2.37), implies that

$$B \text{ is of class } C^\infty \text{ in } (1-\delta, +\infty). \tag{2.40}$$

From (2.29), (2.33), (2.35), (2.36), and (2.40), one gets that

$$B \text{ is of class } C^\infty \text{ in } \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.41}$$

Let us now define $C \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^*)$ by

$$C(z) := -\left(B'' + \frac{N-1}{z}B'\right)^{1/3}, \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^*. \tag{2.42}$$

From (2.29) and (2.42), one has

$$C(z) = C(-z), \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^*. \tag{2.43}$$

From (2.41) and (2.42), one gets that

$$C \text{ is of class } C^\infty \text{ on the set } \{z \in \mathbb{R}^*;\, C(z) \neq 0\}. \tag{2.44}$$

From (2.31) and (2.42), one has

$$C(z) = -(4N)^{\frac{1}{3}}(6+N)^{\frac{1}{9}} < 0, \forall z \in [-\delta, \delta]. \tag{2.45}$$

From (2.36) and (2.42), one has

$$C(z) = \left(2N - \frac{N-1}{2z}\right)^{1/3}, \forall z \in \left[\frac{1}{2} - \delta, \frac{1}{2} + \delta\right]. \tag{2.46}$$

In particular, since $\delta > 0$ is small enough,

$$C \text{ is positive and of class } C^\infty \text{ on } \left[\frac{1}{2} - \delta, \frac{1}{2} + \delta\right]. \tag{2.47}$$

From (2.37), (2.39), and (2.42), one gets that

$$C > 0 \text{ in } [1-\delta, 1) \text{ and } C \text{ is of class } C^\infty \text{ in } [1-\delta, +\infty). \tag{2.48}$$

From (2.43), (2.44), (2.45), (2.47), and (2.48), one sees that

$$C \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \tag{2.49}$$

if

$$C \text{ is of class } C^\infty \text{ in } (\delta, (1/2)-\delta) \cup ((1/2)+\delta, 1-\delta). \tag{2.50}$$

Let us first point out that, by (2.3), (2.4), (2.28), and (2.42),

$$\text{the set of } z_0 \in (\delta, (1/2)-\delta) \cup ((1/2)+\delta, 1-\delta) \text{ such that } C(z_0) = 0 \text{ is finite.} \tag{2.51}$$

We are going to prove that (2.50) indeed holds provided that one no longer requires (2.15) and that one modifies G in a neighborhood of every $z_0 \in (\delta, (1/2)-\delta) \cup ((1/2)+\delta, 1-\delta)$ such that $C(z_0) = 0$. Since $G = -B^3$, this comes from the following lemma.

Lemma 7 *Let $\nu > 0$, $\zeta > 0$, and $\eta > 0$ be such that $[\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta] \subset (0, +\infty)$. Let $B \in C^\infty([\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta])$ be such that*

$$B''(z) + \frac{N-1}{z} B'(z) \neq 0, \, \forall z \in [\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta] \setminus \{\zeta\}. \tag{2.52}$$

Then, there exists $\bar{B} \in C^\infty([\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta])$ satisfying

$$|\bar{B}(z) - B(z)| \leqslant \nu, \, \forall z \in [\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta], \tag{2.53}$$

$$\text{the support of } \bar{B} - B \text{ is included in } (\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta), \tag{2.54}$$

$$\left(\bar{B}'' + \frac{N-1}{z} \bar{B}' \right)^{1/3} \in C^\infty([\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta]) \tag{2.55}$$

and such that, if $\bar{A} \in C^\infty([\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta])$ is the solution of

$$\bar{A}'' + \frac{N-1}{z} \bar{A}' = -\bar{B}^3, \tag{2.56}$$

$$\bar{A}(\zeta - \eta) = A(\zeta - \eta), \, \bar{A}'(\zeta - \eta) = A'(\zeta - \eta), \tag{2.57}$$

then,

$$\bar{A}(\zeta + \eta) = A(\zeta + \eta), \, \bar{A}'(\zeta + \eta) = A'(\zeta + \eta). \tag{2.58}$$

Proof of Lemma 7. Let us first consider the case where

$$\left(B''(\zeta - \eta) + \frac{N-1}{\zeta - \eta} B'(\zeta - \eta) \right) \left(B''(\zeta + \eta) + \frac{N-1}{\zeta + \eta} B'(\zeta + \eta) \right) < 0. \tag{2.59}$$

Then, replacing if necessary B by $-B$ and using (2.52), we may assume that

$$B''(z) + \frac{N-1}{z} B'(z) < 0, \, \forall z \in [\zeta - \eta, \zeta), \tag{2.60}$$

$$B''(z) + \frac{N-1}{z} B'(z) > 0, \, \forall z \in (\zeta, \zeta + \eta). \tag{2.61}$$

Let $\varphi \in C^\infty(-\infty, +\infty)$ be such that

$$\varphi = 1 \text{ in } [-1/2, 1/2], \tag{2.62}$$

$$\varphi = 0 \text{ in } (-\infty, -1] \cup [1, +\infty), \tag{2.63}$$

$$\varphi(z) \in [0, 1], \, \forall z \in (-\infty, \infty). \tag{2.64}$$

Let

$$\mathcal{E} := \{ \xi \in C^\infty([\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta]); \text{ the support of } \xi \text{ is included in } (\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta) \setminus \{\zeta\} \}. \tag{2.65}$$

The vector space $\mathcal{E}$ is equipped with the norm

$$|\xi| := \max\{|\xi(x)|; \, x \in [\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta]\}. \tag{2.66}$$

For $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{E}$, one defines now $H_{\varepsilon,\xi} \in C^\infty([\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta])$ by, if $\varepsilon \neq 0$,

$$H_{\varepsilon,\xi}(z) := \varepsilon^2 (z - \zeta)^3 \varphi \left(\frac{z - \zeta}{|\varepsilon|} \right) + \left(1 - \varphi \left(\frac{z - \zeta}{|\varepsilon|} \right) \right) \left(B''(z) + \frac{N-1}{z} B'(z) + \xi(z) \right), \tag{2.67}$$

for every $z \in [\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta]$ and

$$H_{0,\xi}(z) := B''(z) + \frac{N-1}{z} B'(z) + \xi(z), \ \forall z \in [\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta]. \tag{2.68}$$

We then define $\bar{B} := B_{\varepsilon,\xi} \in C^\infty([\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta])$ by requiring

$$B''_{\varepsilon,\xi}(z) + \frac{N-1}{z} B'_{\varepsilon,\xi}(z) = H_{\varepsilon,\xi}(z), \tag{2.69}$$

$$B_{\varepsilon,\xi}(\zeta - \eta) = B(\zeta - \eta), \ B'_{\varepsilon,\xi}(\zeta - \eta) = B'(\zeta - \eta). \tag{2.70}$$

Let $C_{\varepsilon,\xi} \in C^0([\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta])$ be defined by

$$C_{\varepsilon,\xi}(z) := -\left(B''_{\varepsilon,\xi}(z) + \frac{N-1}{z} B'_{\varepsilon,\xi}(z) \right)^{1/3} = -H_{\varepsilon,\xi}(z)^{1/3}. \tag{2.71}$$

Note that by (2.62), (2.67), and (2.71), if $\varepsilon \neq 0$,

$$C'_{\varepsilon,\xi}(\xi) = -|\varepsilon|^{2/3} \neq 0. \tag{2.72}$$

Using (2.63), (2.65), (2.67), (2.68), and (2.69), one sees that, if $\varepsilon < \eta$ (which is assumed from now on), $B_{\varepsilon,\xi}$ and B are both solutions to the second order differential equation

$$Y''(z) + \frac{N-1}{z} Y'(z) = B''(z) + \frac{N-1}{z} B'(z) \tag{2.73}$$

in a neighborhood of $\{\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta\}$ in $[\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta]$. In particular, by (2.70), $B_{\varepsilon,\xi}$ and B are equal in a neighborhood of $\zeta - \eta$ in $[\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta]$ and (2.54) is equivalent to

$$B_{\varepsilon,\xi}(\zeta + \eta) = B(\zeta + \eta), \ B'_{\varepsilon,\xi}(\zeta + \eta) = B'(\zeta + \eta). \tag{2.74}$$

Let $A_{\varepsilon,\xi} \in C^\infty([\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta])$ be the solution of

$$A''_{\varepsilon,\xi} + \frac{N-1}{z} A'_{\varepsilon,\xi} = -B^3_{\varepsilon,\xi}, \tag{2.75}$$

$$A_{\varepsilon,\xi}(\zeta - \eta) = A(\zeta - \eta), \ A'_{\varepsilon,\xi}(\zeta - \eta) = A'(\zeta - \eta). \tag{2.76}$$

Let $\mathcal{F} : (-\eta, \eta) \times \mathcal{E} \to \mathbb{R}^4$ be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(\varepsilon, \xi) := (&B_{\varepsilon,\xi}(\zeta + \eta) - B(\zeta + \eta), B'_{\varepsilon,\xi}(\zeta + \eta) - B'(\zeta + \eta), \\ &A_{\varepsilon,\xi}(\zeta + \eta) - A(\zeta + \eta), A'_{\varepsilon,\xi}(\zeta + \eta) - A'(\zeta + \eta))^{\mathrm{tr}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.77}$$

One easily checks that

$$\mathcal{F} \text{ is of class } C^1, \tag{2.78}$$

$$\mathcal{F}(0, 0) = 0. \tag{2.79}$$

Let us assume, for the moment, that

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \xi}(0, 0) \text{ is onto.} \tag{2.80}$$

By (2.80), there exists a 4-dimensional subspace $\mathcal{E}_0$ of $\mathcal{E}$ such that

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \xi}(0,0)\mathcal{E}_0 = \mathbb{R}^4. \tag{2.81}$$

By (2.81) and the implicit function theorem, there exists $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,\eta)$ and a map $\xi : (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0) \to \mathcal{E}_0$ such that

$$\xi(0) = 0, \tag{2.82}$$

$$\mathcal{F}(\varepsilon, \xi(\varepsilon)) = 0,\ \forall \varepsilon \in (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0). \tag{2.83}$$

From (2.60), (2.61), (2.65), (2.66), (2.67), (2.68), and (2.69), one gets the existence of $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that

(2.84)

$$B''_{\varepsilon,\xi}(z) + \frac{N-1}{z} B'_{\varepsilon,\xi}(z) < 0,\ \forall z \in [\zeta - \eta, \zeta),\ \forall \varepsilon \in [-\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1],\ \forall \xi \in \mathcal{E}_0 \text{ such that } |\xi| \leqslant \varepsilon_1,$$

(2.85)

$$B''_{\varepsilon,\xi}(z) + \frac{N-1}{z} B'_{\varepsilon,\xi}(z) > 0,\ \forall z \in (\zeta, \zeta + \eta],\ \forall \varepsilon \in [-\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1],\ \forall \xi \in \mathcal{E}_0 \text{ such that } |\xi| \leqslant \varepsilon_1.$$

From (2.62), (2.67), and (2.69) one gets that, for every $\varepsilon \in (0, +\infty)$ and for every $\xi \in \mathcal{E}_0$, one has

$$B''_{\varepsilon,\xi}(z) + \frac{N-1}{z} B'_{\varepsilon,\xi}(z) = \varepsilon^2 (z-\zeta)^3 \text{ if } |z - \zeta| \leqslant \varepsilon/2. \tag{2.86}$$

From (2.71), (2.84), (2.85), and (2.86) one gets that, for every $\varepsilon \in [-\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1] \setminus \{0\}$ and for every $\xi \in \mathcal{E}_0$ such that $|\xi| \leqslant \varepsilon_1$,

$$C_{\varepsilon,\xi} \in C^\infty([\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta]), \tag{2.87}$$

$$(C_{\varepsilon,\xi}(z) = 0) \Leftrightarrow (z = \zeta)\,, \tag{2.88}$$

which, together with (2.81) as above, (2.72), (2.82), and (2.83), conclude the proof of Lemma 7 when (2.59) holds.

It remains to prove (2.80). Simple computations show that

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \xi}(0,0)\xi = (x_1(\zeta+\eta), x_2(\zeta+\eta), x_3(\zeta+\eta), x_4(\zeta+\eta))^{\mathrm{tr}}, \tag{2.89}$$

where $x : [\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta] \to \mathbb{R}^4$ is the solution of

$$\dot{x} = K(t)x + \xi(t)e, \tag{2.90}$$

with

$$K(t) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\dfrac{N-1}{t} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -3B^2(t) & 0 & 0 & -\dfrac{N-1}{t} \end{pmatrix},\ e := \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.91}$$

which satisfies

$$x(\zeta - \eta) = 0. \tag{2.92}$$

Hence, using a standard density argument, (2.81) comes from the following lemma.

Lemma 8 *Let $\nu > 0$, $\zeta > 0$, $\eta > 0$ be such that $[\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta] \subset (0, +\infty)$. Let $B \in C^\infty([\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta])$ be such that*

$$B \not\equiv 0. \tag{2.93}$$

Then the control system (2.90), where the state is $x \in \mathbb{R}^4$ and the control is $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, is controllable on $[\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta]$, i.e. for every X in $\mathbb{R}^4$ there exists $\xi \in L^\infty(\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta)$ such that the solution of (2.90) and (2.92) satisfies $x(\zeta + \eta) = X$.

Proof of Lemma 8. We use a classical result on the controllability of time-varying linear finite-dimensional control systems (see e.g. [16, Theorem 1.18]). One defines, by induction on $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $e_i \in C^\infty([\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta])$ by requiring

$$e_0(t) := e, \, \forall t \in [\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta], \tag{2.94}$$

$$e_i(t) := \dot{e}_{i-1}(t) - K(t)e_{i-1}(t), \, \forall t \in [\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta], \, \forall i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}. \tag{2.95}$$

Let $\theta \in C^\infty([\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta])$ be defined by

$$\theta(t) := -\frac{N-1}{t}, \, \forall t \in [\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta]. \tag{2.96}$$

Straightforward computations lead to

$$e_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ -\theta \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \, e_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \theta \\ -\dot{\theta} + \theta^2 \\ 0 \\ -3B^2 \end{pmatrix}, \, e_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 2\dot{\theta} - \theta^2 \\ -\ddot{\theta} + 3\theta\dot{\theta} - \theta^3 \\ 3B^2 \\ 6B^2\theta - 6B\dot{B} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.97}$$

From (2.91), (2.94), and (2.97), one gets

$$\det(e_0, e_1, e_2, e_3) = 9B^4, \tag{2.98}$$

which, with (2.93) and [16, Theorem 1.18], concludes the proof of Lemma 8. ∎

We now turn to the case where (2.59) does not hold. Then, replacing if necessary B by $-B$ and using (2.52), we may assume that

$$B''(z) + \frac{N-1}{z}B'(z) > 0, \, \forall z \in [\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta] \setminus \{\zeta\}. \tag{2.99}$$

In the definition of $H_{\varepsilon,\xi}$ one replaces (2.67) by

$$H_{\varepsilon,\xi}(z) := \varepsilon^2 \varphi\left(\frac{z-\zeta}{|\varepsilon|}\right) + \left(1 - \varphi\left(\frac{z-\zeta}{|\varepsilon|}\right)\right)\left(B''(z) + \frac{N-1}{z}B'(z) + \xi(z)\right), \tag{2.100}$$

and keeps (2.68). Now (2.84) and (2.85) are replaced by

$$C_{\varepsilon,\xi}(z) > 0, \, \forall z \in [\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta], \, \forall \varepsilon \in [-\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1] \setminus \{0\}, \, \forall \xi \in \mathcal{E}_0 \text{ such that } |\xi| \leqslant \varepsilon_1. \tag{2.101}$$

Therefore, (compare with (2.88)), provided that $\varepsilon \neq 0$, one can see that $C_{\varepsilon,\xi}(z) \neq 0$ for every $z \in [\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta]$ and consequently (1.19) is satisfied. Moreover

$$C_{\varepsilon,\xi} \in C^\infty([\zeta - \eta, \zeta + \eta]), \, \forall \varepsilon \in [-\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1] \setminus \{0\}, \, \forall \xi \in \mathcal{E}_0 \text{ such that } |\xi| \leqslant \varepsilon_1. \tag{2.102}$$

which, together with (2.102), (2.82), (2.83), and (2.101), concludes the proof of Proposition 3. ∎

3 Proof of Theorem 2 (time-varying case)

In this section, we prove Theorem 2. We define $\lambda \in C^\infty([-1,1])$ and $f_0 \in C^\infty([-1,1])$ by

$$\lambda(t) := (1-t^2)^2, \ \forall t \in [-1,1], \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$f_0(t) := \begin{cases} e^{-\frac{1}{1-t^2}} & \text{if } |t|<1, \\ 0 & \text{if } t=0. \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

Let $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$. For $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \in (-1,1)$, we set

$$z := \frac{r}{\varepsilon \lambda(t)} \in [0,+\infty). \tag{3.3}$$

Let A, B, and C be as in Proposition 3. By (2.43), (2.45), (2.47), (2.48), and (2.51), there exist $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and ρ_1, $\rho_2 \ldots \rho_p$ in $(-1,1)\setminus\{0\}$ such that

$$\{z \in (-1,1);\, C(z)=0\} = \{\rho_l;\, l \in \{1,2,\ldots,p\}\}. \tag{3.4}$$

Let

$$\rho_0 := \frac{1}{2},\ \rho_{-1} := -\frac{1}{2}. \tag{3.5}$$

Let $\delta > 0$ be such that

$$[\rho_l-\delta, \rho_l+\delta] \subset (-1,1)\setminus\{0\},\ \forall l \in \{-1,0,1,\ldots,p\}, \tag{3.6}$$

$$[\rho_l-\delta, \rho_l+\delta] \cap [\rho_{l'}-\delta, \rho_{l'}+\delta] = \emptyset,\ \forall (l,l') \in \{-1,0,1,\ldots,p\}^2 \text{ such that } l \neq l'. \tag{3.7}$$

Let $\mathbb{D} := \{(t,r) \in (-1,1)\times\mathbb{R};\, |r| < \varepsilon\lambda(t)\}$. We look for $a : (t,r) \in \mathbb{D} \mapsto a(t,r) \in \mathbb{R}$ in the following form

$$a(t,r) = f_0(t)A(z) + \sum_{l=-1}^{p}\sum_{i=1}^{3} f_{il}(t)g_{il}(z), \tag{3.8}$$

where the functions f_{il}, g_{il} are to be determined with the requirement that

$$\text{the support of } g_{il} \text{ is included in } (\rho_l-\delta, \rho_l+\delta), \forall i \in \{1,2,3\},\ \forall l \in \{-1,0,1,\ldots,p\}. \tag{3.9}$$

Then $b : (t,r) \in \mathbb{D} \mapsto b(t,r) \in \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$b := \left(a_t - a_{rr} - \frac{N-1}{r}a_r\right)^{1/3}, \tag{3.10}$$

and, on every open subset of $\mathbb{D}$ on which b is of class C^2 and b_r/r is bounded, c is defined by

$$c := \left(b_t - b_{rr} - \frac{N-1}{r}b_r\right)^{1/3}. \tag{3.11}$$

For $l \in \{-1, 0, 1, \dots, p\}$, let $\Sigma_l \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$\Sigma_l := \{(t, r) \in (-1, 1) \times \mathbb{R};\ z \in (\rho_l - \delta, \rho_l + \delta)\}\,. \tag{3.12}$$

Let us first study the case where, for some

$$\bar{l} \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}\,, \tag{3.13}$$

$(t, r) \in \Sigma_{\bar{l}}$. By symmetry, we may only study the case where $\rho_{\bar{l}} > 0$. Note that (3.13), together with (1.18) and (3.4), implies that

$$\rho_{\bar{l}} \neq \frac{1}{2}. \tag{3.14}$$

From (3.7), (3.8), (3.9), and (3.12), we have

$$a(t, r) = f_0(t)A(z) + \sum_{i=1}^{3} f_{i\bar{l}}(t) g_{i\bar{l}}(z). \tag{3.15}$$

In order to simplify the notations, we omit the index $\bar{l}$, and define g_0 by

$$g_0 := A. \tag{3.16}$$

(This definition is used all throughout this section.) Then, (3.15) now reads

$$a(t, r) = \sum_{i=0}^{3} f_i(t) g_i(z). \tag{3.17}$$

Note that (1.16), (3.14), and (3.16) imply that

$$B(\rho) \neq 0. \tag{3.18}$$

Moreover, by (1.15), (1.19), (3.4), (3.13), and (3.16),

$$\left(B^{(2)} + \frac{N-1}{z} B^{(1)}\right)(\rho) = 0, \tag{3.19}$$

$$\left(B^{(2)} + \frac{N-1}{z} B^{(1)}\right)_z (\rho) = 0, \tag{3.20}$$

$$\left(B^{(2)} + \frac{N-1}{z} B^{(1)}\right)_{zz} (\rho) = 0, \tag{3.21}$$

$$\left(B^{(2)} + \frac{N-1}{z} B^{(1)}\right)_{zzz} (\rho) \neq 0. \tag{3.22}$$

To simplify the notations we assume that, for example,

$$B(\rho) < 0, \tag{3.23}$$

$$\left(B^{(2)} + \frac{N-1}{z} B^{(1)}\right)_{zzz} (\rho) < 0. \tag{3.24}$$

From (3.20), (3.21), (3.23), and (3.24), if $\delta \in (0, \rho)$ is small enough, there exists $\mu > 0$ such that

$$B(z) \leqslant -\mu, \ \forall z \in [\rho - \delta, \rho + \delta], \tag{3.25}$$

$$\left(B^{(2)} + \frac{N-1}{z} B^{(1)} \right)_{zzz} (z) \leqslant -\mu, \ \forall z \in [\rho - \delta, \rho + \delta]. \tag{3.26}$$

We now fix such a δ.

From (3.10) and (3.17),

$$b = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2/3} \lambda^{2/3}} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{3} \left(f_i g_i^{(2)} + \frac{N-1}{z} f_i g_i^{(1)} + z\varepsilon^2 \lambda \dot{\lambda} f_i g_i^{(1)} - \varepsilon^2 \lambda^2 \dot{f}_i g_i \right) \right)^{1/3}. \tag{3.27}$$

Let us denote by $M : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^* \to \mathbb{R}$, $(t, z) \mapsto M(t, z) \in \mathbb{R}$, the function defined by:

$$M(t,z) := \sum_{i=0}^{3} \Big(f_i(t) g_i^{(2)}(z) + \frac{N-1}{z} f_i(t) g_i^{(1)}(z) + z\varepsilon^2 \lambda(t) \dot{\lambda}(t) f_i(t) g_i^{(1)}(z) - \varepsilon^2 \lambda^2(t) \dot{f}_i(t) g_i(z) \Big). \tag{3.28}$$

For the moment, let us assume that

$$M(t, z) \neq 0, \ \forall (t, z) \in (-1, 1) \times (\rho - \delta, \rho + \delta). \tag{3.29}$$

Using (3.3), (3.11), (3.27), (3.28), and straightforward computations, one gets, on the open set of the $(t, r) \in \Sigma$ such that $M(t, z) \neq 0$,

$$9\varepsilon^{8/3} \lambda^{8/3} c^3 = \nu, \tag{3.30}$$

with

$$\nu := \frac{1}{M^{2/3}} \left(3M_{zz} - 2\frac{M_z^2}{M} + \frac{3(N-1)}{z} M_z + 6\varepsilon^2 \lambda \dot{\lambda} M - 3\varepsilon^2 \lambda^2 M_t + 3z\varepsilon^2 \lambda \dot{\lambda} M_z \right). \tag{3.31}$$

The idea is to construct the f_i's and the g_i's in order to have a precise knowledge of the places where ν vanishes and the order of the vanishing so that ν is the cube of a C^∞ function. More precisely, we are are going to check that one can construct the f_i's and the g_i's so that, at least if $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ is small enough,

$$\nu(t, \rho) = 0, \ \forall t \in (-1, 1), \tag{3.32}$$

$$\nu_z(t, \rho) = 0, \ \forall t \in (-1, 1), \tag{3.33}$$

$$\nu_{zz}(t, \rho) = 0, \ \forall t \in (-1, 1), \tag{3.34}$$

$$\nu_{zzz}(t, \rho) > 0, \ \forall t \in (-1, 1). \tag{3.35}$$

From (3.28), one has

$$M_z = \sum_{i=0}^{3} \Big(f_i g_i^{(3)} + \varepsilon^2 (\dot{\lambda} f_i - \lambda \dot{f}_i) \lambda g_i^{(1)} + \varepsilon^2 z \lambda \dot{\lambda} f_i g_i^{(2)} + \frac{N-1}{z} f_i g_i^{(2)} - \frac{N-1}{z^2} f_i g_i^{(1)} \Big), \tag{3.36}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{zz} &= \sum_{i=0}^{3}\Big(f_i g_i^{(4)} + \varepsilon^2(2\dot\lambda f_i - \lambda \dot f_i)\lambda g_i^{(2)} + \varepsilon^2 z\lambda\dot\lambda f_i g_i^{(3)} \\
&\quad + \frac{N-1}{z} f_i g_i^{(3)} - \frac{2(N-1)}{z^2} f_i g_i^{(2)} + \frac{2(N-1)}{z^3} f_i g_i^{(1)}\Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.37}
$$

We impose that

$$
g_i^{(j)}(\rho) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = 1 \text{ and } j = 4, \\ 0 & \text{if } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant 3,\ 0 \leqslant j \leqslant 4 \text{ and } (i,j) \neq (1,4). \end{cases} \tag{3.38}
$$

From (3.28), (3.36), (3.37), and (3.38), we have

$$
M(\cdot,\rho) = f_0 g_0^{(2)}(\rho) + \frac{N-1}{\rho} f_0 g_0^{(1)}(\rho) + \varepsilon^2\rho\lambda\dot\lambda f_0 g_0^{(1)}(\rho) - \varepsilon^2\lambda^2 \dot f_0 g_0(\rho), \tag{3.39}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_z(\cdot,\rho) &= f_0 g_0^{(3)}(\rho) + \frac{N-1}{\rho} f_0 g_0^{(2)}(\rho) - \frac{N-1}{\rho^2} f_0 g_0^{(1)}(\rho) \\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2(\dot\lambda f_0 - \lambda \dot f_0)\lambda g_0^{(1)}(\rho) + \varepsilon^2\rho\lambda\dot\lambda f_0 g_0^{(2)}(\rho),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.40}
$$

(3.41)

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{zz}(\cdot,\rho) &= f_0 g_0^{(4)}(\rho) + \frac{N-1}{\rho} f_0 g_0^{(3)}(\rho) - \frac{2(N-1)}{\rho^2} f_0 g_0^{(2)}(\rho) + \frac{2(N-1)}{\rho^3} f_0 g_0^{(1)}(\rho) \\
&\quad + f_1 + \varepsilon^2(2\dot\lambda f_0 - \lambda \dot f_0)\lambda g_0^{(2)}(\rho) + \varepsilon^2\rho\lambda\dot\lambda f_0 g_0^{(3)}(\rho).
\end{aligned}
$$

From (1.14), (3.1), (3.2), (3.16), (3.23), (3.39), and (3.40), one has, at least if $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough, which is from now on assumed,

$$
\forall t \in (-1,1), M(t,\rho) > 0. \tag{3.42}
$$

Then, for $z = \rho$, one has

(3.43)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\nu(.,\rho) &= \frac{1}{M^{2/3}(.,\rho)} \Big(3M_{zz}(.,\rho) - 2\frac{M_z^2(.,\rho)}{M(.,\rho)} + \frac{3(N-1)}{\rho} M_z(.,\rho) + 6\varepsilon^2\lambda\dot\lambda M_z(.,\rho) \\
&\quad - 3\varepsilon^2\lambda^2 M_t(.,\rho) + 3\rho\varepsilon^2\lambda\dot\lambda M_z(.,\rho)\Big).
\end{aligned}
$$

We then choose to define $f_1 : t \in (-1,1) \mapsto f_1(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ by

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_1 &:= -f_0 g_0^{(4)}(\rho) - \frac{N-1}{\rho} f_0 g_0^{(3)}(\rho) + \frac{2(N-1)}{\rho^2} f_0 g_0^{(2)}(\rho) - \frac{2(N-1)}{\rho^3} f_0 g_0^{(1)}(\rho) \\
&\quad - \varepsilon^2(2\dot\lambda f_0 - \lambda \dot f_0)\lambda g_0^{(2)}(\rho) - \varepsilon^2\rho\lambda\dot\lambda f_0 g_0^{(3)}(\rho) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{3}\Big(2\frac{M_z^2(.,\rho)}{M(.,\rho)} - \frac{3(N-1)}{\rho} M_z(.,\rho) - 6\varepsilon^2\lambda\dot\lambda M(.,\rho) \\
&\quad + 3\varepsilon^2\lambda^2 M_t(.,\rho) - 3\rho\varepsilon^2\lambda\dot\lambda M_z(.,\rho)\Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.44}
$$

Note that, even if M depends on f_1, f_2, and f_3, the right hand side of (3.44) does not depend on f_1, f_2, and f_3, and f_1 is indeed well-defined by (3.44). This definition of f_1, together with (3.41) and (3.43), implies that (3.32) holds. (In fact, f_1 is defined by (3.44) precisely in order

to have (3.32).) From (3.1), (3.2), (3.19), (3.23), (3.39), (3.40), and (3.44), we obtain the existence of two polynomials $p_1(\varepsilon^2,t)$ and $q_1(\varepsilon^2,t)$ in the variables ε^2 and t such that

$$f_1(t)=\varepsilon^2\frac{p_1(\varepsilon^2,t)}{1+q_1(\varepsilon^2,t)}f_0(t),\ \forall t\in(-1,1). \tag{3.45}$$

In order to simplify the notations, we set:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} K(t,z) & := & -\dfrac{2M_z(t,z)^2}{M(t,z)}+\dfrac{3(N-1)}{z}M_z(t,z)+6\varepsilon^2\lambda\dot\lambda M(t,z)\\ & & -3\varepsilon^2\lambda^2M_t(t,z)+3z\varepsilon^2\lambda\dot\lambda M_z(t,z).\end{array} \tag{3.46}$$

We then have

$$\nu=M^{-\frac{2}{3}}(3M_{zz}+K). \tag{3.47}$$

Differentiating this equality with respect to z, we obtain

$$\nu_z=M^{-\frac{5}{3}}(3MM_{zzz}+MK_z-2M_zM_{zz}-\frac{2}{3}M_zK). \tag{3.48}$$

Differentiating (3.46) with respect to z, we get

$$\begin{array}{rcl} K_z & = & -\dfrac{4M_zM_{zz}}{M^2}+\dfrac{2M_z^3}{M^3}+\dfrac{3(N-1)}{z}M_{zz}-\dfrac{3(N-1)}{z^2}M_z\\ & & +9\varepsilon^2\lambda\dot\lambda M_z-3\varepsilon^2\lambda^2M_{tz}+3\varepsilon^2z\lambda\dot\lambda M_{zz}.\end{array} \tag{3.49}$$

Then, differentiating (3.37) with respect to z, we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} M_{zzz} & =\displaystyle\sum_{i=0}^{3} & \Big(f_ig_i^{(5)}+\dfrac{N-1}{z}f_ig_i^{(4)}-\dfrac{3(N-1)}{z^2}f_ig_i^{(3)}+\dfrac{6(N-1)}{z^3}f_ig_i^{(2)}\\ & & -\dfrac{6(N-1)}{z^4}f_ig_i^{(1)}+\varepsilon^2z\lambda\dot\lambda f_ig_i^{(4)}+\varepsilon^2(3\dot\lambda f_i-\lambda\dot f_i)\lambda g_i^{(3)}\Big).\end{array} \tag{3.50}$$

We impose that

$$g_i^{(5)}(\rho)=\begin{cases}1 & \text{if } i=2,\\ 0 & \text{if } i\in\{1,3\}.\end{cases} \tag{3.51}$$

From (3.38), (3.50), and (3.51), we have

(3.52)

$$\begin{array}{rcl} M_{zzz}(.,\rho) & = & f_0g_0^{(5)}(\rho)+\dfrac{N-1}{\rho}f_0g_0^{(4)}(\rho)-\dfrac{3(N-1)}{\rho^2}f_0g_0^{(3)}(\rho)+\dfrac{6(N-1)}{\rho^3}f_0g_0^{(2)}(\rho)\\ & & -\dfrac{6(N-1)}{\rho^4}f_0g_0^{(1)}(\rho)+f_2+\dfrac{N-1}{\rho}f_1\\ & & +\varepsilon^2(3\dot\lambda f_0-\lambda\dot f_0)\lambda g_0^{(3)}(\rho)+\varepsilon^2\rho\lambda\dot\lambda f_0g_0^{(4)}(\rho)+\varepsilon^2\rho\lambda\dot\lambda f_1.\end{array}$$

We then define $f_2 : t \in (-1,1) \mapsto f_2(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ by

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_2 \;:=\; & -f_0 g_0^{(5)}(\rho) - \frac{N-1}{\rho} f_0 g_0^{(4)}(\rho) + \frac{3(N-1)}{\rho^2} f_0 g_0^{(3)}(\rho) \\
& - \frac{6(N-1)}{\rho^3} f_0 g_0^{(2)}(\rho) + \frac{6(N-1)}{\rho^4} f_0 g_0^{(1)}(\rho) - \frac{N-1}{\rho} f_1 \\
& + \frac{1}{3M(.,\rho)} (-M(.,\rho) K_z(.,\rho) + 2M_z(.,\rho) M_{zz}(.,\rho) + \frac{2}{3} M_z(.,\rho) K(.,\rho)) \\
& - \varepsilon^2 \rho \lambda \dot{\lambda} f_0 g_0^{(4)}(\rho) - \varepsilon^2 \rho \lambda \dot{\lambda} f_1 - \varepsilon^2 (3\dot{\lambda} f_0 - \lambda \dot{f}_0) \lambda g_0^{(3)}(\rho).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.53}
$$

Note that, again, even if M depends on f_2 and f_3, the right hand side of (3.53) does not depend on f_2 and f_3 (it depends on f_1, however f_1 is already defined in (3.44)), and f_2 is indeed well defined by (3.53). This definition of f_2, together with (3.48) and (3.52), implies (3.33). From (3.1), (3.2), (3.20), (3.39), (3.40), (3.41), (3.45), (3.46), (3.49), and (3.53), we obtain the existence of two polynomials $p_2(\varepsilon^2, t)$ and $q_2(\varepsilon^2, t)$ in the variables ε^2 and t such that

$$
f_2(t) = \varepsilon^2 \frac{p_2(\varepsilon^2, t)}{1 + q_2(\varepsilon^2, t)} f_0(t), \; \forall t \in (-1,1). \tag{3.54}
$$

Differentiating (3.48) with respect to z, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\nu_{zz} \;=\; & M^{-\frac{8}{3}} \Big(-4MM_zM_{zzz} - \frac{7}{3} MM_zK_z + \frac{10}{3} M_z^2 M_{zz} + \frac{10}{9} M_z^2 K \\
& + 3M^2 M_{zzzz} + MM_zK_z + M^2 K_{zz} - 2MM_{zz}^2 - \frac{2}{3} MM_{zz}K \Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.55}
$$

Differentiating (3.49) with respect to z, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
K_{zz} \;=\; & -\frac{4M_{zz}^2}{M} - \frac{4M_zM_{zzz}}{M} + \frac{10M_z^2M_{zz}}{M^2} - \frac{4M_z^4}{M^3} + \frac{6(N-1)}{z^3} M_z \\
& - \frac{6(N-1)}{z^2} M_{zz} + \frac{3(N-1)}{z} M_{zzz} + 12\varepsilon^2 \lambda \dot{\lambda} M_{zz} - 3\varepsilon^2 \lambda^2 M_{tzz} + 3z\varepsilon^2 \lambda \dot{\lambda} M_{zzz}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.56}
$$

Differentiating (3.50) with respect to z, one has

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{zzzz} \;=\; & \sum_{i=0}^{3} \Big(\; f_i g_i^{(6)} + \frac{N-1}{z} f_i g_i^{(5)} - \frac{4(N-1)}{z^2} f_i g_i^{(4)} \\
& + \frac{12(N-1)}{z^3} f_i g_i^{(3)} - \frac{24(N-1)}{z^4} f_i g_i^{(2)} + \frac{24(N-1)}{z^5} f_i g_i^{(1)} \\
& + \varepsilon^2 (4\dot{\lambda} f_i - \lambda \dot{f}_i) \lambda g_i^{(4)} + \varepsilon^2 z \lambda \dot{\lambda} f_i g_i^{(5)} \Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.57}
$$

We then impose

$$
g_i^{(6)}(\rho) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = 3, \\ 0 & \text{if } i \in \{1,2\}. \end{cases} \tag{3.58}
$$

Evaluating M_{zzzz} at $z=\rho$ in (3.57) gives

$$\begin{aligned} M_{zzzz}(.,\rho) &= f_0 g_0^{(6)}(\rho)+f_3+\frac{N-1}{\rho}f_0 g_0^{(5)}(\rho)-\frac{4(N-1)}{\rho^2}f_0 g_0^{(4)}(\rho)\\ &+\frac{12(N-1)}{\rho^3}f_0 g_0^{(3)}(\rho)-\frac{24(N-1)}{\rho^4}f_0 g_0^{(2)}(\rho)+\frac{24(N-1)}{\rho^5}f_0 g_0^{(1)}(\rho)\\ &+\frac{N-1}{\rho}f_2-\frac{4(N-1)}{\rho^2}f_1+\varepsilon^2(4\dot\lambda f_0-\lambda\dot f_0)\lambda g_0^{(4)}(\rho)\\ &+\varepsilon^2(4\dot\lambda f_1-\lambda\dot f_1)\lambda+\varepsilon^2\rho\lambda\dot\lambda f_0 g_0^{(5)}(\rho)+\varepsilon^2\rho\lambda\dot\lambda f_2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.59}$$

Then, we define $f_3 : t\in(-1,1)\mapsto f_3(t)\in\mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} f_3 &:= -f_0 g_0^{(6)}(\rho)-\frac{N-1}{\rho}f_0 g_0^{(5)}(\rho)+\frac{4(N-1)}{\rho^2}f_0 g_0^{(4)}(\rho)-\frac{12(N-1)}{\rho^3}f_0 g_0^{(3)}(\rho)\\ &+\frac{24(N-1)}{\rho^4}f_0 g_0^{(2)}(\rho)-\frac{24(N-1)}{\rho^5}f_0 g_0^{(1)}(\rho)-\frac{N-1}{\rho}f_2+\frac{4(N-1)}{\rho^2}f_1\\ &-\varepsilon^2\rho\lambda\dot\lambda f_0 g_0^{(5)}(\rho)-\varepsilon^2(4\dot\lambda f_0-\lambda\dot f_0)\lambda g_0^{(4)}(\rho)-\varepsilon^2\rho\lambda\dot\lambda f_2-\varepsilon^2(4\dot\lambda f_1-\lambda\dot f_1)\lambda\\ &+\frac{1}{3M^2(.,\rho)}\Big(4M(.,\rho)M_z(.,\rho)M_{zzz}(.,\rho)+\frac{7}{3}M(.,\rho)M_z(.,\rho)K_z(.,\rho)\\ &-\frac{10}{3}M_z^2(.,\rho)M_{zz}(.,\rho)-\frac{10}{9}M_z^2(.,\rho)K(.,\rho)-M(.,\rho)M_z(.,\rho)K_z(.,\rho)\\ &-M^2(.,\rho)K_{zz}(.,\rho)+2M(.,\rho)M_{zz}^2(.,\rho)+\frac{2}{3}M(.,\rho)M_{zz}(.,\rho)K(.,\rho)\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.60}$$

Once more, even if M depends on f_3, the right hand side of (3.60) does not depend on f_3, and f_3 is indeed well defined by (3.60). This definition of f_3, together with (3.55) and (3.59), implies that (3.34) holds. From (3.1), (3.2), (3.21), (3.39), (3.40), (3.41), (3.45), (3.46), (3.49), (3.52), (3.54), (3.56), and (3.60), we obtain the existence of two polynomials $p_3(\varepsilon^2,t)$ and $q_3(\varepsilon^2,t)$ in the variables ε^2 and t, such that

$$f_3(t)=\varepsilon^2\frac{p_3(\varepsilon^2,t)}{1+q_3(\varepsilon^2,t)}f_0(t),\ \forall t\in(-1,1). \tag{3.61}$$

We are now in a position to analyse the regularity of a, b, and c on Σ. Let us first point out that, by (3.1), (3.2), (3.8), (3.45), (3.54), and (3.61), there exists $\psi^a : (t,z)\in[-1,1]\times[\rho-\delta,\rho+\delta]\mapsto\psi^a(t,z)\in\mathbb{R}$ of class C^∞ such that

$$a(t,r)=f_0(t)\psi^a(t,z),\forall(t,r)\in\Sigma. \tag{3.62}$$

In particular, a is of class C^∞ in Σ. From (1.14), (3.1), (3.2), (3.16), (3.27), (3.25), (3.45), (3.54), and (3.61), we get that, at least if $\varepsilon>0$ is small enough, there there exists ψ^b : $(t,z)\in[-1,1]\times[\rho-\delta,\rho+\delta]\mapsto\psi^b(t,z)\in\mathbb{R}$ of class C^∞ such that

$$b<0 \text{ in } \Sigma, \tag{3.63}$$

$$b(t,r)=\lambda^{-2/3}f_0(t)^{1/3}\psi^b(t,z),\forall(t,r)\in\Sigma. \tag{3.64}$$

In particular, b is of class C^∞ in Σ.

Let us now study c. Differentiating (3.55) with respect to z one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{zzz} &= M^{-\frac{11}{3}}\Big(10MM_z^2M_{zzz}+\frac{10}{3}MM_z^2K_z-\frac{80}{9}M_z^3M_{zz}-\frac{80}{27}M_z^3K-6M^2M_zM_{zzzz}\\ &-2M^2M_zK_{zz}+10MM_zM_{zz}^2+\frac{10}{3}MM_zM_{zz}K-8M^2M_{zz}M_{zzz}\\ &-2M^2M_{zz}K_z+3M^3M_{zzzzz}+M^3K_{zzz}-\frac{2}{3}M^2M_{zzz}K\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.65}$$

Differentiating (3.57) with respect to z, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{zzzzz} &= \sum_{i=0}^{3}\Big(\quad f_i g_i^{(7)} + \frac{N-1}{z} f_i g_i^{(6)} - \frac{5(N-1)}{z^2} f_i g_i^{(5)} + \frac{20(N-1)}{z^3} f_i g_i^{(4)} \\
&\qquad -\frac{60(N-1)}{z^4} f_i g_i^{(3)} + \frac{120(N-1)}{z^5} f_i g_i^{(2)} - \frac{120(N-1)}{z^6} f_i g_i^{(1)} \\
&\qquad +\varepsilon^2(5\dot\lambda f_i - \lambda \dot f_i)\lambda g_i^{(5)} + \varepsilon^2 z\lambda\dot\lambda f_i g_i^{(6)}\Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.66}
$$

Differentiating (3.56) with respect to z, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
K_{zzz} &= \frac{6M_z^2 M_{zz}}{M} - \frac{4M_z M_{zzzz}}{M} + \frac{24 M_z M_{zz}^2}{M^2} + \frac{4M_{zz}M_{zzz}}{M} - \frac{36M_z^3 M_{zz}}{M^3} + \frac{12M_z^5}{M^4} \\
&\quad -\frac{18(N-1)}{z^4} M_z + \frac{18(N-1)}{z^3} M_{zz} - \frac{9(N-1)}{z^2} M_{zzz} + \frac{3(N-1)}{z} M_{zzzz} \\
&\quad +15\varepsilon^2\lambda\dot\lambda M_{zzz} - 3\varepsilon^2\lambda^2 M_{tzzz} + 3z\varepsilon^2\lambda\dot\lambda M_{zzzz}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.67}
$$

From (3.1), (3.2), (3.26), (3.28), (3.30), (3.31), (3.32), (3.33), (3.34), (3.36), (3.37), (3.45), (3.46), (3.49), (3.50), (3.54), (3.56), (3.61), (3.65), (3.66), and (3.67), one gets the existence of $\phi : (t,z) \in [-1,1]\times[\rho-\delta,\rho+\delta] \mapsto \phi(t,z) \in \mathbb{R}$ of class C^∞ such that

$$c^3(t,r) = \lambda^{8/3} f_0(t)^{1/3}\phi(t,z), \forall (t,r)\in\Sigma, \tag{3.68}$$

$$\phi(t,\rho) = 0,\ \forall t\in[-1,1], \tag{3.69}$$

$$\partial_z\phi(t,\rho) = 0,\ \forall t\in[-1,1], \tag{3.70}$$

$$\partial_{zz}^2\phi(t,\rho) = 0,\ \forall t\in[-1,1], \tag{3.71}$$

$$\partial_{zzz}^3\phi(t,z) > 0,\ \forall (t,z)\in[-1,1]\times[\rho-\delta,\rho+\delta]. \tag{3.72}$$

Let $\tilde\phi : (t,z)\in[-1,1]\times[\rho-\delta,\rho+\delta] \mapsto \tilde\phi(t,z)\in\mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$\tilde\phi(t,z) := \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 (1-s)^2\partial_{zzz}^3\phi(t,\rho+s(z-\rho)))ds,\ \forall (t,z)\in[-1,1]\times[\rho-\delta,\rho+\delta]. \tag{3.73}$$

Then, $\tilde\phi$ is of class C^∞ on $[-1,1]\times[\rho-\delta,\rho+\delta]$ and, using (3.69), (3.70), (3.71), and (3.72),

$$\phi(t,z) = (z-\rho)^3\tilde\phi(t,z),\ \forall (t,z)\in[-1,1]\times[\rho-\delta,\rho+\delta], \tag{3.74}$$

$$\tilde\phi(t,z) > 0,\ \forall (t,z)\in[-1,1]\times[\rho-\delta,\rho+\delta]. \tag{3.75}$$

Let $\psi^c : (t,z)\in[-1,1]\times[\rho-\delta,\rho+\delta] \mapsto \psi^c(t,z)\in\mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$\psi^c(t,z) := (z-\rho)\tilde\phi(t,z)^{1/3},\ \forall (t,z)\in[-1,1]\times[\rho-\delta,\rho+\delta]. \tag{3.76}$$

By (3.68), (3.74), (3.75), and (3.76), one gets that

$$\psi^c \in C^\infty([-1,1]\times[\rho-\delta,\rho+\delta]), \tag{3.77}$$

$$c(t,r) = \lambda^{-8/9} f_0(t)^{1/9}\psi^c(t,z), \forall (t,r)\in\Sigma. \tag{3.78}$$

In particular, c is of class C^∞ in Σ.

Let us now study the case $l \in \{-1, 0\}$, i.e. $\rho_l = 1/2$ or $\rho_l = -1/2$. By symmetry, we may assume that $l = 0$ so that $\rho_l = 1/2$. This case is simpler than the previous one. It is already treated in [18], except that we now have to take care of c. So, we will only briefly sketch the arguments. By (1.18) we may impose on δ to be small enough so that

$$C(z) > 0, \forall z \in [(1/2) - \delta, (1/2) + \delta]. \tag{3.79}$$

We now define (see (3.27) and compare with (3.31))

$$\nu := \sum_{i=0}^{3} \Big(f_i g_i^{(2)} + \frac{N-1}{z} f_i g_i^{(1)} + z\varepsilon^2 \lambda\dot{\lambda} f_i g_i^{(1)} - \varepsilon^2 \lambda^2 \dot{f}_i g_i \Big). \tag{3.80}$$

We still want to ensure that (3.32) to (3.34). This is achieved by now imposing

$$f_1 := -\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 \lambda\dot{\lambda} f_0 g_0^{(1)}(\frac{1}{2}) + \varepsilon^2 \lambda^2 \dot{f}_0 g_0(\frac{1}{2}), \tag{3.81}$$

$$f_2 := -\left[(2(N-1) f_1 + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 \lambda\dot{\lambda}) + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 \lambda\dot{\lambda} f_0 g_0^{(2)}(\frac{1}{2}) + (\varepsilon^2 \lambda\dot{\lambda} f_0 - \varepsilon^2 \lambda^2 \dot{f}_0) g_0^{(1)}(\frac{1}{2}) \right], \tag{3.82}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f_3 \;:=\; & -\Big[(2(N-1) + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 \lambda\dot{\lambda}) f_2 + (2\varepsilon^2 \lambda\dot{\lambda} - 8(N-1)) f_1 - \varepsilon^2 \lambda^2 \dot{f}_1 \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 \lambda\dot{\lambda} f_0 g_0^{(3)}(\frac{1}{2}) + (2\varepsilon^2 \lambda\dot{\lambda} f_0 - \varepsilon^2 \lambda^2 \dot{f}_0) g_0^{(2)}(\frac{1}{2}) \Big], \end{aligned} \tag{3.83}$$

where the g_i's now satisfy

$$g_1^{(2)}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = g_2^{(3)}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = g_3^{(4)}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = 1, \tag{3.84}$$

$$g_i^{(j)}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = 0, \forall (i,j) \in \{1,2,3\} \times \{0,1,2,3,4\} \setminus \{(1,2),(2,3),(3,4)\}. \tag{3.85}$$

Then a still satisfies (3.62) for some function ψ^a of class C^∞ on $[-1,1] \times [\rho - \delta, \rho + \delta]$. Proceeding as we did to prove (3.78), we get the existence of ψ^b of class C^∞ on $[-1,1] \times [\rho - \delta, \rho + \delta]$ such that (3.64) holds. Now the case of the function c is simpler than before since, at least for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, we get from (3.79) that $c > 0$ in Σ and the existence ψ^c of class C^∞ on $[-1,1] \times [\rho - \delta, \rho + \delta]$ such that (3.78) holds.

The case where

$$(t,r) \in \Sigma' := \big\{ (t,r) \in (-1,1) \times \mathbb{R};\, z \in (-1,1) \setminus \big(\cup_{l=-1}^{p} [\rho_l - (\delta/2), \rho_l + (\delta/2)] \big) \big\} \tag{3.86}$$

is even simpler than the two previous ones since, by (3.9)

$$g_1 = g_2 = g_3 = 0. \tag{3.87}$$

One gets that (3.62), (3.64), and (3.78) hold on Σ' where

$$\psi^a,\, \psi^b, \psi^c \in C^\infty \left([-1,1] \times \left([-1,1] \setminus \left(\cup_{l=-1}^{p} (\rho_l - (\delta/2), \rho_l + (\delta/2)) \right) \right) \right). \tag{3.88}$$

In conclusion, from these three cases we get the existence of three functions ψ^a, ψ^b, and ψ^c such that

$$\psi^a,\, \psi^b, \psi^c \in C^\infty([-1,1] \times [-1,1]), \tag{3.89}$$

$$a(t,r) = f_0(t)\psi^a(t,z), \forall (t,r) \in \mathbb{D}, \tag{3.90}$$

$$b(t,r) = \lambda(t)^{-2/3} f_0(t)\psi^b(t,z), \forall (t,r) \in \mathbb{D}, \tag{3.91}$$

$$c(t,r) = \lambda(t)^{-8/9} f_0(t)\psi^c(t,z), \forall (t,r) \in \mathbb{D}, \tag{3.92}$$

which, together with (3.1) and (3.2), imply that, if a, b, and c are extended to all of $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}$ by 0 outside $\mathbb{D}$, then a, b, and c are of class C^∞ on $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 2. ∎

4 Proof of Theorem 1

In this section, we show how to deduce Theorem 1 from Theorem 2 by means of the return method, an algebraic solvability and classical controllability results.

Let $x_0\in\omega$. Let $\bar r>0$ be small enough so that

$$\left(\left|t-\frac{T}{2}\right|\leqslant\bar r^2 \text{ and } |x-\bar x_0|\leqslant\bar r\right)\Rightarrow(t\in(0,T) \text{ and } x\in\omega)\,. \tag{4.1}$$

Let $\bar\alpha:\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^N\to\mathbb{R}$, $\bar\beta:\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^N\to\mathbb{R}$, $\bar\gamma:\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^N\to\mathbb{R}$ and $\bar u:\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^N\to\mathbb{R}$ be defined by, for every $(t,x)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^N$,

$$\bar\alpha(t,x):=\bar r^8 a\left(\frac{t-(T/2)}{\bar r^2},\frac{1}{\bar r}\,|x-x_0|\right), \tag{4.2}$$

$$\bar\beta(t,x):=\bar r^2 b\left(\frac{t-(T/2)}{\bar r^2},\frac{1}{\bar r}\,|x-x_0|\right), \tag{4.3}$$

$$\bar\gamma(t,x):=c\left(\frac{t-(T/2)}{\bar r^2},\frac{1}{\bar r}\,|x-x_0|\right), \tag{4.4}$$

$$\bar u(t,x):=\bar\gamma_t(t,x)-\Delta\bar\gamma(t,x). \tag{4.5}$$

From (1.5), (1.7), (1.8), (1.9), (4.2), (4.3), (4.4), and (4.5), the functions $\bar\alpha$, $\bar\beta$, $\bar\gamma$, and $\bar u$ are of class C^∞ and satisfy

$$\bar\alpha_t-\Delta\bar\alpha=\bar\beta^3 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^N, \tag{4.6}$$

$$\bar\beta_t-\Delta\bar\beta=\bar\gamma^3 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^N, \tag{4.7}$$

$$\bar\gamma_t-\Delta\bar\gamma=\bar u\chi_\omega \text{ in } \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^N, \tag{4.8}$$

$$\text{the supports of } \bar\alpha,\ \bar\beta,\ \bar\gamma, \text{ and } \bar u \text{ are included in } (0,T)\times\omega. \tag{4.9}$$

Let $(\alpha^0,\beta^0,\gamma^0)^{\rm tr}\in L^\infty(\Omega)^3$. For $(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)^{\rm tr}\in L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)^3$ and $u\in L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)$, let us define $(\hat\alpha,\hat\beta,\hat\gamma)^{\rm tr}\in L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)^3$ and $\hat u\in L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)$ by, for every $(t,x)\in(0,T)\times\Omega$,

$$\hat\alpha(t,x):=\alpha(t,x)-\bar\alpha(t,x), \tag{4.10}$$

$$\hat\beta(t,x):=\beta(t,x)-\bar\beta(t,x), \tag{4.11}$$

$$\hat\gamma(t,x):=\gamma(t,x)-\bar\gamma(t,x), \tag{4.12}$$

$$\hat u(t,x):=u(t,x)-\bar u(t,x). \tag{4.13}$$

From (4.6), (4.7), (4.8), and (4.9), $(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)^{\rm tr}\in L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)^3$ is the solution of the Cauchy problem (1.2) if and only if $(\hat\alpha,\hat\beta,\hat\gamma)^{\rm tr}\in L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)^3$ is the solution of the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases}
\hat\alpha_t-\Delta\hat\alpha=3\bar\beta^2\hat\beta+3\bar\beta\hat\beta^2+\hat\beta^3 & \text{in } (0,T)\times\Omega,\\
\hat\beta_t-\Delta\hat\beta=3\bar\gamma^2\hat\gamma+3\bar\gamma\hat\gamma^2+\hat\gamma^3 & \text{in } (0,T)\times\Omega,\\
\hat\gamma_t-\Delta\hat\gamma=\hat u\chi_\omega & \text{in } (0,T)\times\Omega,\\
\hat\alpha=\hat\beta=\hat\gamma=0 & \text{in } (0,T)\times\partial\Omega,\\
\hat\alpha(0,\cdot)=\alpha^0(\cdot),\ \hat\beta(0,\cdot)=\beta^0(\cdot),\ \hat\gamma(0,\cdot)=\gamma^0(\cdot) & \text{in } \Omega.
\end{cases} \tag{4.14}$$

Moreover, by (4.9), (4.10), (4.11) and (4.12), one has

$$\alpha(T,\cdot)=\hat{\alpha}(T,\cdot),\ \beta(T,\cdot)=\hat{\beta}(T,\cdot),\ \gamma(T,\cdot)=\hat{\gamma}(T,\cdot)\ \text{in}\ \Omega. \tag{4.15}$$

Let us consider the system

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\alpha}_t-\Delta\hat{\alpha}=3\bar{\beta}^2\hat{\beta}+3\bar{\beta}\hat{\beta}^2+\hat{\beta}^3 & \text{in } (0,T)\times\Omega,\\ \hat{\beta}_t-\Delta\hat{\beta}=3\bar{\gamma}^2\hat{\gamma}+3\bar{\gamma}\hat{\gamma}^2+\hat{\gamma}^3 & \text{in } (0,T)\times\Omega,\\ \hat{\gamma}_t-\Delta\hat{\gamma}=\hat{u}\chi_\omega & \text{in } (0,T)\times\Omega,\\ \hat{\alpha}=\hat{\beta}=\hat{\gamma}=0 & \text{in } (0,T)\times\partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{4.16}$$

as a control system where, at time $t\in[0,T]$, the state is $(\hat{\alpha}(t,\cdot),\hat{\beta}(t,\cdot),\hat{\gamma}(t,\cdot))^{\rm tr}\in L^\infty(\Omega)^3$, and the control is $\hat{u}(t,\cdot)\in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Note that $(\hat{\alpha},\hat{\beta},\hat{\gamma})^{\rm tr}=0$ and $\hat{u}=0$ is a trajectory (i.e. a solution) of this control system. The linearized control system around this (null) trajectory is the linear control system

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\alpha}_t-\Delta\hat{\alpha}=3\bar{\beta}^2\hat{\beta} & \text{in } (0,T)\times\Omega,\\ \hat{\beta}_t-\Delta\hat{\beta}=3\bar{\gamma}^2\hat{\gamma} & \text{in } (0,T)\times\Omega,\\ \hat{\gamma}_t-\Delta\hat{\gamma}=\hat{u}\chi_\omega & \text{in } (0,T)\times\Omega,\\ \hat{\alpha}=\hat{\beta}=\hat{\gamma}=0 & \text{in } (0,T)\times\partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{4.17}$$

where, at time $t\in[0,T]$, the state is $(\hat{\alpha}(t,\cdot),\hat{\beta}(t,\cdot),\hat{\gamma}(t,\cdot))^{\rm tr}\in L^\infty(\Omega)^3$, and the control is $\hat{u}(t,\cdot)\in L^\infty(\Omega)$.

By (1.6), (4.3), and (4.4), there exists a nonempty open subset ω_1 of ω, $t_1\in(0,T)$ and $t_2\in(0,T)$ such that

$$\overline{\omega_1}\subset\omega, \tag{4.18}$$

$$0<t_1<t_2<T, \tag{4.19}$$

$$\bar{\beta}(t,x)\neq 0,\ \forall (t,x)\in[t_1,t_2]\times\overline{\omega_1}, \tag{4.20}$$

$$\bar{\gamma}(t,x)\neq 0,\ \forall (t,x)\in[t_1,t_2]\times\overline{\omega_1}. \tag{4.21}$$

Let ω_2 be a nonempty open subset of ω_1 such that

$$\overline{\omega_2}\subset\omega_1. \tag{4.22}$$

Let us recall that, by (the proof of) [24, Theorem 2.4, Chapter 1], the linear control system

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\alpha}_t-\Delta\hat{\alpha}=3\bar{\beta}^2\hat{\beta}+v_1\chi_{(t_1,t_2)\times\omega_2} & \text{in } (0,t_2)\times\Omega,\\ \hat{\beta}_t-\Delta\hat{\beta}=3\bar{\gamma}^2\hat{\gamma}+v_2\chi_{(t_1,t_2)\times\omega_2} & \text{in } (0,t_2)\times\Omega,\\ \hat{\gamma}_t-\Delta\hat{\gamma}=v_3\chi_{(t_1,t_2)\times\omega_2} & \text{in } (0,t_2)\times\Omega,\\ \hat{\alpha}=\hat{\beta}=\hat{\gamma}=0 & \text{in } (0,t_2)\times\partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{4.23}$$

where, at time $t\in[0,t_2]$, the state is $(\hat{\alpha}(t,\cdot),\hat{\beta}(t,\cdot),\hat{\gamma}(t,\cdot))^{\rm tr}\in L^\infty(\Omega)^3$ and the control is $(v_1(t,\cdot),v_2(t,\cdot),v_3(t,\cdot))^{\rm tr}\in L^\infty(\Omega)^3$ is null controllable. We next point out that, with the terminology of [27, page 148] (see also [19]), the underdetermined system

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\alpha}_t-\Delta\tilde{\alpha}=3\bar{\beta}^2\tilde{\beta}+v_1 & \text{in } (t_1,t_2)\times\omega_1,\\ \tilde{\beta}_t-\Delta\tilde{\beta}=3\bar{\gamma}^2\tilde{\gamma}+v_2 & \text{in } (t_1,t_2)\times\omega_1,\\ \tilde{\gamma}_t-\Delta\tilde{\gamma}=v_3+\tilde{u} & \text{in } (t_1,t_2)\times\omega_1, \end{cases} \tag{4.24}$$

where the data is $(v_1, v_2, v_3)^{\rm tr} : (t_1, t_2) \times \omega_1 \to \mathbb{R}^3$ and the unknown is $(\tilde\alpha, \tilde\beta, \tilde\gamma, \tilde u)^{\rm tr} : (t_1, t_2) \times \omega_1 \to \mathbb{R}^4$ is algebraically solvable, i.e. there are solutions of (4.24) such that the unknown can be expressed in terms of the derivatives of the data. Indeed, for $(v_1, v_2, v_3)^{\rm tr} \in \mathcal{D}'((t_1, t_2) \times \omega_1)^3$, if $(\tilde\alpha, \tilde\beta, \tilde\gamma, \tilde u)^{\rm tr} \in \mathcal{D}'((t_1, t_2) \times \omega_1)^4$ is defined by

$$\tilde\alpha := 0, \tag{4.25}$$

$$\tilde\beta := -\frac{v_1}{3\bar\beta^2}, \tag{4.26}$$

$$\tilde\gamma := \frac{1}{3\bar\gamma^2}\left(-\left(\frac{v_1}{3\bar\beta^2}\right)_t + \Delta\left(\frac{v_1}{3\bar\beta^2}\right) - v_2\right), \tag{4.27}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde u \;:=\; & -v_3 + \left(\frac{1}{3\bar\gamma^2}\left(-\left(\frac{v_1}{3\bar\beta^2}\right)_t + \Delta\left(\frac{v_1}{3\bar\beta^2}\right) - v_2\right)\right)_t - \Delta\left(\frac{1}{3\bar\gamma^2}\left(-\left(\frac{v_1}{3\bar\beta^2}\right)_t\right.\right. \\ & \left.\left. +\Delta\left(\frac{v_1}{3\bar\beta^2}\right) - v_2\right)\right),\end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

then (4.24) holds. This algebraic solvability is a key ingredient for the following proposition.

Proposition 9 *There exists $\eta > 0$ such that, for every $(\alpha^0, \beta^0, \gamma^0)^{tr} \in L^\infty(\Omega)^3$ satisfying*

$$|\alpha^0|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + |\beta^0|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + |\gamma^0|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < \eta, \tag{4.29}$$

there exists $\hat u \in L^\infty((0, t_2) \times \Omega)$ such that the solution $(\hat\alpha, \hat\beta, \hat\gamma)^{tr} \in L^\infty((0, t_2) \times \Omega)^3$ of the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} \hat\alpha_t - \Delta\hat\alpha = 3\bar\beta^2\hat\beta + 3\bar\beta\hat\beta^2 + \hat\beta^3 & \text{in } (0, t_2) \times \Omega, \\ \hat\beta_t - \Delta\hat\beta = 3\bar\gamma^2\hat\gamma + 3\bar\gamma\hat\gamma^2 + \hat\gamma^3 & \text{in } (0, t_2) \times \Omega, \\ \hat\gamma_t - \Delta\hat\gamma = \hat u\chi_\omega & \text{in } (0, t_2) \times \Omega, \\ \hat\alpha = \hat\beta = \hat\gamma = 0 & \text{in } (0, t_2) \times \partial\Omega, \\ \hat\alpha(0, \cdot) = \alpha^0(\cdot),\ \hat\beta(0, \cdot) = \beta^0(\cdot),\ \hat\gamma(0, \cdot) = \gamma^0(\cdot) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{4.30}$$

satisfies

$$\hat\alpha(t_2, \cdot) = \hat\beta(t_2, \cdot) = \hat\gamma(t_2, \cdot) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega. \tag{4.31}$$

The proof of Proposition 9 is given in Appendix A. It is an adaptation of [19], which deals with Navier-Stokes equations, to our parabolic system. Besides a suitable inverse mapping theorem, it mainly consists of the following two steps.

(i) Prove that the control system (4.30) with two "fictitious" controls added on the first two equations is null controllable by means of smooth controls. See Proposition 11.

(ii) Remove the two "fictitious" controls by using the algebraic solvability, as in [13] and [19]. See (the proof of) Proposition 14.

With the notations of Proposition 9, we extend $(\hat\alpha, \hat\beta, \hat\gamma)^{\rm tr}$ and $\hat u$ to all of $(0, T) \times \Omega$ by requiring

$$\hat\alpha(t, x) = \hat\beta(t, x) = \hat\gamma(t, x) = \hat u(t, x) = 0,\ \forall (t, x) \in (t_2, T) \times \Omega. \tag{4.32}$$

Then, by (4.30) and (4.31), one has (4.14) and

$$\hat{\alpha}(T,\cdot)=\hat{\beta}(T,\cdot)=\hat{\gamma}(T,\cdot)=0 \text{ in } \Omega. \tag{4.33}$$

Let us define $(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)^{\rm tr}\in L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)^3$ and $u\in L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)$ by imposing (4.10), (4.11), (4.12), and (4.13). Then, from (4.14), one has (1.2) and, using (4.15) together with (4.33), one has (1.3). This concludes the proof of Theorem 1 if (4.29) holds.

However, assumption (4.29) can be removed by using the following simple homogeneity argument: If $((\alpha,\beta,\gamma)^{\rm tr},u)\in L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)^3\times L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)$ is a trajectory (i.e. a solution) of the control system (1.1), then for every $s>0$, $((\alpha^s,\beta^s,\gamma^s)^{\rm tr},u^s):=((s^9\alpha,s^3\beta,s\gamma)^{\rm tr},su)$ is a trajectory (i.e. a solution) of the control system (1.1). This concludes the proof of Theorem 1. ∎

A Proof of Proposition 9

Let $\hat{1}_{\omega_2}:\mathbb{R}^3\to[0,1]$ be a function of class C^∞ which is equal to 1 on ω_2 and whose support is included in ω_1, and let $\zeta:\mathbb{R}\to[0,1]$ be such that ζ is equal to 0 on $(-\infty,(2t_1+t_2)/3]$ and is equal to 1 on $((t_1+2t_2)/3,+\infty)$. Let $\vartheta:\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^3\to\mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$\vartheta(t,x):=\zeta(t)\hat{1}_{\omega_2}(x),\ \forall (t,x)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^3. \tag{A.1}$$

From now on, we set, $Q:=(t_1,t_2)\times\Omega$ and, for $\eta\in(0,1)$ and $K>0$,

$$\rho_\eta(t):=e^{\frac{-K}{\eta(t_2-t)}},\ \rho_1(t):=e^{\frac{-K}{(t_2-t)}},\ \forall t\in[t_1,t_2). \tag{A.2}$$

We have the following Carleman estimates proven in [24, Chapter 1].

Lemma 10 *Let $\eta\in(0,1)$. There exist $K:=K(\eta)>0$ and $C:=C(K)>0$ such that, for every $g=(g_1,g_2,g_3)^{tr}\in L^2((t_1,t_2)\times\Omega)^3$ and for every solution $z=(\hat{\alpha},\hat{\beta},\hat{\gamma})^{tr}\in L^2((t_1,t_2),H^2(\Omega)^3)\cap H^1((t_1,t_2),L^2(\Omega)^3)$ of the parabolic system, which is the adjoint of (4.17),*

$$\begin{cases} -\hat{\alpha}_t-\Delta\hat{\alpha}=g_1 & \text{in } (t_1,t_2)\times\Omega,\\ -\hat{\beta}_t-\Delta\hat{\beta}-3\bar{\beta}^2\hat{\alpha}=g_2 & \text{in } (t_1,t_2)\times\Omega,\\ -\hat{\gamma}_t-\Delta\hat{\gamma}-3\bar{\gamma}^2\hat{\beta}=g_3 & \text{in } (t_1,t_2)\times\Omega,\\ \hat{\alpha}=\hat{\beta}=\hat{\gamma}=0 & \text{in } (t_1,t_2)\times\partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{A.3}$$

one has

$$|\sqrt{\rho_\eta}z|^2_{L^2(Q)^3}+|z(t_1,\cdot)|^2_{L^2(\Omega)^3}\leqslant C\left(\int_{(t_1,t_2)\times\Omega}\vartheta\rho_1|z|^2+\int_{(t_1,t_2)\times\Omega}\rho_1|g|^2\right). \tag{A.4}$$

Let us now derive from Lemma 10 a proposition on the null-controllability with controls which are smooth functions for the control system (4.17) with a right hand side term.

Proposition 11 *Let $\eta\in(0,1)$ be such that*

$$\eta>\frac{2}{3} \tag{A.5}$$

and let K be as in Lemma 10. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $p \in [2, +\infty)$. Then, for every $f = (f_1, f_2, f_3)^{tr} \in L^p(Q)^3$ such that ${\rho_\eta}^{-1/2} f \in L^p(Q)^3$ and for every $(\alpha^0, \beta^0, \gamma^0)^{tr} \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)^3 \cap W^{2,p}(\Omega)^3$, there exists $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \in L^2(Q)^3$ satisfying

$$e^{\frac{K\eta^2}{2(t_2-t)}} \vartheta u \in L^2((t_1,t_2), H^{2k}(\Omega)^3) \cap H^k((t_1,t_2), L^2(\Omega)^3), \tag{A.6}$$

such that the solution $\hat{y} := (\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\gamma})^{tr}$ of

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\alpha}_t - \Delta\hat{\alpha} = 3\bar{\beta}^2\hat{\beta} + f_1 + \vartheta u_1 & \text{in } (t_1,t_2)\times\Omega, \\ \hat{\beta}_t - \Delta\hat{\beta} = 3\bar{\gamma}^2\hat{\gamma} + f_2 + \vartheta u_2 & \text{in } (t_1,t_2)\times\Omega, \\ \hat{\gamma}_t - \Delta\hat{\gamma} = f_3 + \vartheta u_3 & \text{in } (t_1,t_2)\times\Omega, \\ \hat{\alpha} = \hat{\beta} = \hat{\gamma} = 0 & \text{in } (t_1,t_2)\times\partial\Omega, \\ \hat{\alpha}(t_1,\cdot) = \alpha^0(\cdot),\ \hat{\beta}(t_1,\cdot) = \beta^0(\cdot),\ \hat{\gamma}(t_1,\cdot) = \gamma^0(\cdot) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{A.7}$$

satisfies

$$e^{\frac{K}{2(t_2-t)}} \hat{y} \in L^p((t_1,t_2), W^{2,p}(\Omega)^3) \cap W^{1,p}((t_1,t_2), L^p(\Omega)^3). \tag{A.8}$$

Proof of Proposition 11. We adapt the proof of [19, Proposition 4] to our situation. Modifying if necessary f, we may assume without loss of generality that

$$(\alpha^0, \beta^0, \gamma^0)^{\mathrm{tr}} = 0. \tag{A.9}$$

Let us define a linear operator $S : \mathcal{D}'(Q)^3 \to \mathcal{D}'(Q)^3$ by

$$Sz := \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha_t - \Delta\alpha \\ -\beta_t - \Delta\beta - 3\bar{\beta}^2\alpha \\ -\gamma_t - \Delta\gamma - 3\bar{\gamma}^2\beta \end{pmatrix}, \forall z = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{D}'(Q)^3. \tag{A.10}$$

We define a closed linear unbounded operator $\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{S}) \subset L^2(Q)^3 \to L^2(Q)^3$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{S}) := \{ z = (\alpha,\beta,\gamma)^{\mathrm{tr}} \in L^2((t_1,t_2), H_0^1 \cap H^2(\Omega)^3) \\ \cap H^1((t_1,t_2), L^2(\Omega)^3);\ z(t_2,\cdot) = 0 \}, \end{aligned} \tag{A.11}$$

$$\mathcal{S}z = Sz. \tag{A.12}$$

Let

$$X_0 := L^2(Q). \tag{A.13}$$

For $m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, we set

$$X_m := \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{S}^m), \tag{A.14}$$

Let us point out that

$$< z_1, z_2 >_{X_m} := < \mathcal{S}^m z_1, \mathcal{S}^m z_2 >_{L^2(Q)^3} \tag{A.15}$$

is a scalar product on X_m. From now on X_m is equipped with this scalar product. Then X_m is an Hilbert space. For $m \in \mathbb{Z} \cap (-\infty, 0)$, let

$$X_m := X'_{-m}, \tag{A.16}$$

where X'_{-m} denotes the dual space of X_{-m}. We choose the pivot space $L^2(Q)^3 = X_0$. In particular (A.16) is an equality for $m = 0$. For every $(k, l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $k \leqslant l$, one has

$$X_l \subset X_k. \tag{A.17}$$

Note that, since Ω is only of class C^2, in general, for $m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$,

$$X_m \not\subset L^2((t_1, t_2), H^{2m}(\Omega)^3) \cap H^m((t_1, t_2), L^2(\Omega)^3). \tag{A.18}$$

However, even with Ω only of class C^2, by classical results on the interior regularity of parabolic systems, for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, for every open subset Ω_0 such that $\overline{\Omega_0} \subset \Omega$, and for every $z \in X_m$,

$$z_{|(t_1,t_2)\times\Omega_0} \in L^2((t_1, t_2), H^{2m}(\Omega_0)^3) \cap H^m((t_1, t_2), L^2(\Omega_0)^3). \tag{A.19}$$

(Note that this property is not known to hold for the linearized Navier-Stokes equations considered in [19] for Ω only of class C^2 ; this is why Ω is assumed to be of class C^∞ in [19].)

For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, one can define $\mathcal{S}^*$ as an operator from X_{-m} into X_{-m-1} by setting, for every $z_1 \in X_{-m-1}$ and for every $z_2 \in X_{m+1}$,

$$< \mathcal{S}^* z_1, z_2 >_{X_{-m-1}, X_{m+1}} := < z_1, \mathcal{S} z_2 >_{X_{-m}, X_m} . \tag{A.20}$$

(One easily checks that this definition is consistent: it gives the same image if z_1 is also in $X_{-m'}$ for some $m' \in \mathbb{N}$). This implies in particular that, for every $z_1 \in L^2(Q)^3$ and for every $z_2 \in X_m$, one has, for every $0 \leqslant j \leqslant l$,

$$< (\mathcal{S}^*)^l z_1, z_2 >_{X_{-l}, X_l} = < (\mathcal{S}^*)^{l-j} z_1, (\mathcal{S})^j z_2 >_{X_{j-l}, X_{l-j}} . \tag{A.21}$$

Let $\mathcal{H}_0$ be the set of $z \in H^1((t_1, t_2), L^2(\Omega)^3) \cap L^2((t_1, t_2), H^2(\Omega)^3)$ such that

$$\sqrt{\rho_1} S z \in X_k, \tag{A.22}$$

$$\sqrt{\vartheta \rho_1} z \in L^2(Q)^3. \tag{A.23}$$

Let q be the following bilinear form defined on $\mathcal{H}_0$:

$$q(z, w) := < \sqrt{\rho_1} S z, \sqrt{\rho_1} S w >_{X_k} + \int_Q \vartheta \rho_1 z \cdot w. \tag{A.24}$$

(This is the analogue of the bilinear form denoted by a in [19].) From (A.4), we deduce that q is a scalar product on $\mathcal{H}_0$. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the completion of $\mathcal{H}_0$ for this scalar product. Note that, still from (A.4) and also from the definition of $\mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{H}$ is a subspace of $L^2_{loc}((t_1, t_2), H^1_0(\Omega)^3)$ and, for every $z \in \mathcal{H}$, one has (A.22), (A.23), and

$$|{\rho_\eta}^{1/2} z|_{L^2(Q)^3} \leqslant C \sqrt{q(z, z)}, \ \forall z \in \mathcal{H}. \tag{A.25}$$

As in [19], using the Riesz representation theorem together with (A.25), one gets that there exists a unique

$$\hat{z} \in \mathcal{H} \tag{A.26}$$

verifying, for every $w \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$< \mathcal{S}^k(\sqrt{\rho_1} S\hat{z}), \mathcal{S}^k(\sqrt{\rho_1} Sw) >_{L^2(Q)^3} - \int_Q u \cdot w = \int_Q f \cdot w, \tag{A.27}$$

with

$$u := -\rho_1 \hat{z}. \tag{A.28}$$

We then set

$$\tilde{y} := (\mathcal{S}^*)^k \mathcal{S}^k(\sqrt{\rho_1} S\hat{z}) \in X_{-k}. \tag{A.29}$$

We want to gain regularity on $\tilde{y}$ by accepting to have a weaker exponential decay rate for $\tilde{y}$ when t is close to t_2 (in the spirit of [24, Theorem 2.4, Chapter 1] and [9]). Let $\psi \in C^\infty([t_1, t_2])$ and $y \in X_{-1}$. One can define $\psi y \in X_{-1}$ in the following way. Since $\mathcal{S}^* : X_0 \to X_{-1}$ is onto, there exists $h \in X_0$ such that $\mathcal{S}^* h = y$. We define ψy by

$$\psi y = \psi \mathcal{S}^* h := -\psi' h + \mathcal{S}^*(\psi h). \tag{A.30}$$

This definition is compatible with the usual definition of ψy if $y \in X_0$. We can then define by induction on m $\psi y \in X_{-m}$ for $\psi \in C^\infty([t_1, t_2])$ and $y \in X_{-m}$ in the same way. Using (A.29), this allows us to define

$$\hat{y} := \sqrt{\rho_1} \tilde{y} \in X_{-k}. \tag{A.31}$$

From (A.27), (A.28), (A.29), and (A.31), one gets

$$\mathcal{S}^* \hat{y} = f + \vartheta u \text{ in } X_{-k-1}. \tag{A.32}$$

Let

$$\tilde{K} \in (0, K) \text{ and } \tilde{\rho}_1 := e^{-\tilde{K}/(t_2 - t)}. \tag{A.33}$$

Using (A.28), (A.29), and (A.32), one has

$$\mathcal{S}^* \left(\left(\sqrt{\rho_1} / \sqrt{\tilde{\rho}_1} \right) \tilde{y} \right) = \left(1/\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}_1} \right)' \sqrt{\rho_1} \tilde{y} + \left(1/\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}_1} \right) (f + u) \text{ in } X_{-k}. \tag{A.34}$$

We want to deduce from (A.34) some information on the regularity of $\tilde{y}$. This can be achieved thanks to the following lemma, the proof of which is similar to the proof of [19, Lemma 4].

Lemma 12 *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. If $y \in X_{-m}$ and $\mathcal{S}^* y \in X_{-m}$, then $y \in X_{-m+1}$.*

From (A.31), (A.34), and Lemma 12, one gets that

$$\left(\sqrt{\rho_1}/\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}_1}\right)\tilde{y} \in X_{-k+1},\ \forall \tilde{K} \in (0,K).$$

Using an easy induction argument together with Lemma 12 (and the fact that one can choose $\tilde{K} < K$ arbitrarily close to K), we deduce that, for every $\tilde{K} \in (0,K)$, $\left(\sqrt{\rho_1}/\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}_1}\right)\tilde{y} \in X_0$.

Let us now focus on u. Let us define

$$v := \rho_1 \hat{z}. \tag{A.35}$$

Using (A.25), one gets that

$$\rho_1{}^{-1}\rho_\eta{}^{1/2}v \in L^2(Q)^3. \tag{A.36}$$

Using (A.26) together with regularity results for S applied on $\tilde{\rho}_1^{-1}\rho_\eta{}^{1/2}v \in L^2(Q)^3$ and, as above for the proof of (A.36), a bootstrap argument (together with the fact that one can choose $\tilde{K} \in (0,K)$ arbitrarily close to K), one obtains that

$$\tilde{\rho}_1^{-1}\rho_\eta{}^{1/2}v \in X_k,\ \forall \tilde{K} \in (0,K). \tag{A.37}$$

Let us point out that (A.5) implies that

$$\eta^2 - 2 + \frac{1}{\eta} < 0. \tag{A.38}$$

From (A.5), (A.19), (A.28), (A.35), (A.37), and (A.38), one gets (A.6).

Let us now deal with $\hat{y}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$4k > 2 + N, \tag{A.39}$$

so that

$$L^2((t_1,t_2),H^{2k}(\Omega)^3) \cap H^k((t_1,t_2),L^2(\Omega)^3) \subset L^\infty(Q). \tag{A.40}$$

From (A.32), (A.40), and (A.37), we deduce (by looking at the parabolic system verified by $(1/\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}_1})\hat{y}$ and using usual regularity results for linear parabolic systems) that

$$\left(1/\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}_1}\right)\hat{y} \in L^p((t_1,t_2),W^{2,p}(\Omega)^3) \cap W^{1,p}((t_1,t_2),L^p(\Omega)^3),\ \forall \tilde{K} \in (0,K), \tag{A.41}$$

which, together with (A.32), concludes the proof of Proposition 11. ∎

To end the proof of Proposition 9, we are going to apply the following inverse mapping theorem (see [5, Chapter 2, Section 2.3]).

Proposition 13 *Let E and F be two Banach spaces. Let $\mathcal{F} : E \to F$ be of class C^1 in a neighborhood of 0. Let us assume that the operator $\mathcal{F}'(0) \in \mathcal{L}(E,F)$ is onto. Then there exist $\eta > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that for every $g \in F$ verifying $|g - \mathcal{F}(0)| < \eta$, there exists $e \in E$ such that*

(i) $\mathcal{F}(e) = g$,

(ii) $|e|_E \leqslant C|g - \mathcal{F}(0)|_F$.

We now use the same technique as in [24, Theorem 4.2]. For $y := (\alpha, \beta, \gamma)^{\mathrm{tr}} \in \mathcal{D}'(Q)^3$ and for $v \in \mathcal{D}'(Q)$, one defines $\mathcal{L}(y, v) \in \mathcal{D}'(Q)^3$ by

$$\mathcal{L}(y, v) := \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_t - \Delta\alpha - 3\bar{\beta}^2\beta \\ \beta_t - \Delta\beta - 3\bar{\gamma}^2\gamma \\ \gamma_t - \Delta\gamma - v \end{pmatrix}. \tag{A.42}$$

Let $\eta \in (0, 1)$ and let $K = K(\eta) > 0$ be as in Lemma 10. We apply Proposition 13 with E and F defined in the following way. Let E be the space of the functions

$$(y, v) \in L^p(Q)^3 \times L^\infty(Q)$$

such that

(i) $e^{\frac{\eta^3 K}{2(t_2 - t)}} y \in L^p((t_1, t_2), W^{2,p}(\Omega)^3) \cap W^{1,p}((t_1, t_2), L^p(\Omega)^3)$,

(ii) $e^{\frac{\eta^3 K}{2(t_2 - t)}} v \in L^\infty(Q)^3$ and the support of v is included in $(t_1, t_2) \times \omega$,

(iii) $e^{\frac{K}{2\eta(t_2 - t)}} \mathcal{L}(y, v) \in L^p(Q)^3$,

(iv) $y(t_1, \cdot) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)^3 \cap W^{2,p}(\Omega)^3$,

equipped with the following norm which makes it a Banach space:

$$\begin{aligned} |(y, v)|_E := {} & |e^{\frac{\eta^3 K}{2(t_2 - t)}} y|_{L^p((t_1,t_2), W^{2,p}(\Omega)^3) \cap W^{1,p}((t_1,t_2), L^p(\Omega)^3)} \\ & + |e^{\frac{\eta^3 K}{2(t_2 - t)}} v|_{L^\infty(Q)} + |e^{\frac{K}{2\eta(t_2 - t)}} \mathcal{L}(y, v)|_{L^p(Q)^3} + |y(t_1, \cdot)|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)^3}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.43}$$

Let F be the space of the functions $(h, y^0) \in L^p(Q)^3 \times \left(W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)^3 \cap W^{2,p}(\Omega)^3\right)$ such that

$$e^{\frac{K}{2\eta(t_2 - t)}} h \in L^p(Q)^3 \tag{A.44}$$

equipped with the following norm which makes it a Banach space:

$$|(h, y^0)|_F := |e^{\frac{\eta K_1}{2(t_2 - t)}} h|_{L^p(Q)^3} + |y^0|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)^3}. \tag{A.45}$$

We define $\mathcal{F} : E \to F$ by

$$\mathcal{F}(y, v) = \left(\mathcal{L}(y, v) - \begin{pmatrix} 3\bar{\beta}\beta^2 + \beta^3 \\ 3\bar{\gamma}\gamma^2 + \gamma^3 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, y(t_1, \cdot) \right). \tag{A.46}$$

One easily sees that $\mathcal{F}$ is of class C^1 if

$$p > \frac{N + 2}{2} \text{ and } \eta > \frac{1}{2^{1/4}}. \tag{A.47}$$

From now on, we assume $p > 2$ and $\eta \in (0, 1)$ are chosen so that (A.47) holds. Note that the second inequality of (A.47) implies that (A.5) holds. Let us assume for the moment that the following proposition holds.

Proposition 14 *One has*

$$\mathcal{F}'(0,0)(E) = F. \tag{A.48}$$

Then the assumptions of Proposition 13 hold. Since Proposition 9 follows from the conclusion of Proposition 13 by taking $\hat{u} = 0$ in $(0,t_1)\times\Omega$, this concludes the proof of Proposition 9.

It only remains to prove Proposition 14. Let $f = (f_1, f_2, f_3)^{\rm tr}$ and $y^0 = (\alpha^0, \beta^0, \gamma^0)^{\rm tr}$ be such that $(f, y^0) \in F$. Let us choose k large enough so that

$$N + 2 < 4(k-2). \tag{A.49}$$

Using Proposition 11, we get the existence of $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \in L^2(Q)^3$ satisfying (A.6) such that the solution $\hat{y} := (\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\gamma})^{\rm tr}$ of (A.7) satisfies (A.8). We now use the algebraic solvability of (4.24) (i.e. that (4.25), (4.26), (4.27), and (4.28) imply (4.24)) with

$$v := \vartheta u. \tag{A.50}$$

We get that, if $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{u})^{\rm tr} \in \mathcal{D}'((t_1,t_2)\times\omega_1)^4$ is defined by (4.25), (4.26), (4.27), and (4.28), then (4.24) holds. We extend $\tilde{\alpha}$, $\tilde{\beta}$, $\tilde{\gamma}$, and $\tilde{u}$ to $(t_1,t_2)\times\Omega$ by 0 outside $(t_1,t_2)\times(\Omega\setminus\omega_1)$ and still denote by $\tilde{\alpha}$, $\tilde{\beta}$, $\tilde{\gamma}$, and $\tilde{u}$ these extensions. Note that (4.24) still holds on $(t_1,t_2)\times\Omega$ and that (see, in particular (A.1))

$$\tilde{\alpha}(t_1,\cdot) = \tilde{\beta}(t_1,\cdot) = \tilde{\gamma}(t_1,\cdot) = 0. \tag{A.51}$$

Finally we define $y := (\alpha, \beta, \gamma)^{\rm tr} \in \mathcal{D}'((t_1,t_2)\times\omega_1)^3$ and $u \in \mathcal{D}'((t_1,t_2)\times\omega_1)$ by

$$\alpha := \hat{\alpha} - \tilde{\alpha},\ \beta := \hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta},\ \gamma := \hat{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}, u := -\tilde{u}. \tag{A.52}$$

From (4.25), (4.26), (4.27) (4.28), (A.6), (A.8), (A.49), (A.50), and (A.52), we get that $(y,u) \in E$. Then, from (4.24), (A.7), (A.50), (A.51), and (A.52), we get that $\mathcal{F}'(0,0)(y,u) = (y^0, f)$. This concludes the proof of Proposition 14 and therefore also the proof of Proposition 9. ■

Remark 15 *1. Instead of proceeding as in [19] in order to prove Proposition 9, one can also proceed as in [18]. For that, an important step is to prove that small (in a suitable sense) perturbations of the linear control system* (4.17) *are controllable by means of bounded controls (see [18, Section 3.1.2]. This controllability property follows from [25, Theorem 4.1] and one can also get it by following [18, Section 3.1.2] or [22]. 2. Let us emphasize that the algebraic solvability of* (4.24) *leads to a loss of derivatives. This problem is managed in our situation thanks to hypoelliptic properties of parabolic equations. These properties do not hold, for example, for hyperbolic equations. However, for these last equations, the loss of derivatives problem can be solved thanks to a Nash-Moser inverse mapping theorem due to Gromov [27, Section 2.3.2, Main Theorem]. See [3] for the first use of this inverse mapping theorem in the context of control of partial differential equations.*

References

[1] Fatiha Alabau-Boussouira. A hierarchic multi-level energy method for the control of bidiagonal and mixed n-coupled cascade systems of PDE's by a reduced number of controls. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 18(11-12):1005–1072, 2013.

[2] Fatiha Alabau-Boussouira. Insensitizing exact controls for the scalar wave equation and exact controllability of 2-coupled cascade systems of PDE's by a single control. *Math. Control Signals Systems*, 26(1):1–46, 2014.

[3] Fatiha Alabau-Boussouira, Jean-Michel Coron, and Guillaume Olive. Internal controllability of first order quasilinear hyperbolic systems with a reduced number of controls. *Preprint, hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01139980*, 2015.

[4] Fatiha Alabau-Boussouira and Matthieu Léautaud. Indirect controllability of locally coupled wave-type systems and applications. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 99(5):544–576, 2013.

[5] Vladimir Mikhailovĭch Alekseev, Vladimir Mikhailovĭch Tikhomirov, and Sergeĭ Vasil′evich Fomin. *Optimal control*. Contemporary Soviet Mathematics. Consultants Bureau, New York, 1987. Translated from the Russian by V. M. Volosov.

[6] Farid Ammar-Khodja, Assia Benabdallah, Manuel González-Burgos, and Luz de Teresa. Recent results on the controllability of linear coupled parabolic problems: A survey. *Mathematical Control and Related Fields*, 1(3):267–306, 2011.

[7] Farid Ammar-Khodja, Assia Benabdallah, Manuel González-Burgos, and Luz de Teresa. Minimal time for the null controllability of parabolic systems: The effect of the condensation index of complex sequences. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 267(7):2077–2151, 2014.

[8] Farid Ammar-Khodja, Assia Benabdallah, Manuel González-Burgos, and Luz de Teresa. Minimal time of controllability of two parabolic equations with disjoint control and coupling domains. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 352(5):391–396, 2014.

[9] Viorel Barbu. Local controllability of the phase field system. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 50(3, Ser. A: Theory Methods):363–372, 2002.

[10] Assia Benabdallah, Franck Boyer, Manuel González-Burgos, and Guillaume Olive. Sharp Estimates of the One-Dimensional Boundary Control Cost for Parabolic Systems and Application to the N-Dimensional Boundary Null Controllability in Cylindrical Domains. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 52(5):2970–3001, 2014.

[11] Franck Boyer and Guillaume Olive. Approximate controllability conditions for some linear 1D parabolic systems with space-dependent coefficients. *Math. Control Relat. Fields*, 4(3):263–287, 2014.

[12] Nicolás Carreño and Sergio Guerrero. Local null controllability of the N-dimensional Navier-Stokes system with $N-1$ scalar controls in an arbitrary control domain. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*, 15(1):139–153, 2013.

[13] Jean-Michel Coron. Global asymptotic stabilization for controllable systems without drift. *Math. Control Signals Systems*, 5(3):295–312, 1992.

[14] Jean-Michel Coron. On the controllability of 2-D incompressible perfect fluids. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 75(2):155–188, 1996.

[15] Jean-Michel Coron. Local controllability of a 1-D tank containing a fluid modeled by the shallow water equations. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 8:513–554 (electronic), 2002. A tribute to J. L. Lions.

[16] Jean-Michel Coron. *Control and nonlinearity*, volume 136 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2007.

[17] Jean-Michel Coron and Sergio Guerrero. Local null controllability of the two-dimensional Navier-Stokes system in the torus with a control force having a vanishing component. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 92(5):528–545, 2009.

[18] Jean-Michel Coron, Sergio Guerrero, and Lionel Rosier. Null controllability of a parabolic system with a cubic coupling term. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 48(8):5629–5653, 2010.

[19] Jean-Michel Coron and Pierre Lissy. Local null controllability of the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes system with a distributed control having two vanishing components. *Invent. Math.*, 198(3):833–880, 2014.

[20] Luz de Teresa. Insensitizing controls for a semilinear heat equation. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 25(1-2):39–72, 2000.

[21] Luz de Teresa and Enrique Zuazua. Identification of the class of initial data for the insensitizing control of the heat equation. *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.*, 8(1):457–471, 2009.

[22] Michel Duprez and Pierre Lissy. Indirect controllability of some linear parabolic systems of m equations with $m-1$ controls involving coupling terms of zero or rst order. *Preprint, https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01162108v2*.

[23] Enrique Fernández-Cara, Sergio Guerrero, Oleg Yu. Imanuvilov, and Jean-Pierre Puel. Some controllability results for the N-dimensional Navier-Stokes and Boussinesq systems with $N-1$ scalar controls. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 45(1):146–173 (electronic), 2006.

[24] Andrei V. Fursikov and Oleg Yu. Imanuvilov. *Controllability of evolution equations*, volume 34 of *Lecture Notes Series*. Seoul National University Research Institute of Mathematics Global Analysis Research Center, Seoul, 1996.

[25] Manuel González-Burgos and Luz de Teresa. Controllability results for cascade systems of m coupled parabolic PDEs by one control force. *Port. Math.*, 67(1):91–113, 2010.

[26] Manuel González-Burgos and Rosario Pérez-García. Controllability results for some nonlinear coupled parabolic systems by one control force. *Asymptot. Anal.*, 46(2):123–162, 2006.

[27] Mikhael Gromov. *Partial differential relations*, volume 9 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986.

[28] Sergio Guerrero. Controllability of systems of Stokes equations with one control force: existence of insensitizing controls. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 24(6):1029–1054, 2007.

[29] Sergio Guerrero. Null controllability of some systems of two parabolic equations with one control force. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 46(2):379–394, 2007.

[30] Lionel Rosier and Luz de Teresa. Exact controllability of a cascade system of conservative equations. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 349(5-6):291–296, 2011.